

Wake up from your
nightmare . . .



and other sociopolitical essays.

- American activist political
theory for the 21st century -

A.J. MacDonald Jr.

*“To those who seek love, peace,
justice, and community.”*



*Wake-up from your nightmare . . . and other
sociopolitical essays* - American activist political
theory for the 21st century - © 2011 A. J. MacDonald,
Jr. All rights reserved. Cover photo: © 2011 A. J.
MacDonald, Jr. - Abortion clinic 16th and L Street NW,
Washington, DC; back cover photo: © 2011 A. J.
MacDonald, Jr. Photo on page 108 credit: © 2002
AP/Nasser Nasser.

Contents

Introduction	[5]
Wake up from your Nightmare	[7]
Propaganda and the People	[16]
9/11 - America's Open Wound	[29]
The Roman Lawyers against the Washington Politicians	[32]
The Public Safety Exception	[36]
Shame and 9/11 Truth	[39]
Postmodern Economics	[41]
On Political Violence in America	[45]
How I Became a Liberal Communist Tree-Hugger	[48]
Foucault and the Folly of the Narcissistic Self	[52]
Love Implementing the Demands of Justice	[59]
Mexico's Cult(ure) of Death	[62]
The Wrong Answer to the Arizona Question	[66]

How the Feds Plan to Stop Homegrown
Terrorism [\[71\]](#)

The Demise of Anglo-American Colonialism
[\[75\]](#)

Security and Terrorism: *Reducio ad Absurdum*
..... [\[76\]](#)

The Enemy of Freedom [\[79\]](#)

The Future of America Depends upon Justice
for the Unborn [\[82\]](#)

Choose Life: March for Life - 2011 [\[91\]](#)

A World Without Nukes: Dream? or Nightmare?
..... [\[92\]](#)

Is it Okay to be Gay? [\[95\]](#)

Political Observations 2011: US Government
Illegitimate [\[100\]](#)

Rachael Maddow's Faulty Gun-Control Argument
..... [\[102\]](#)

The Day I was DONE with Israel and the US
Government - 3/30/2002 [\[108\]](#)

Why I am SO DONE with Alex Jones - Egypt,
Libya, Israel, and Charlie Sheen [\[113\]](#)

The End of the Nation-State? [\[118\]](#)

Introduction

The [Days of Rage](#), which are now (early 2011) taking place [throughout](#) the Middle East, are, I believe, new, profound, and long awaited favorable (political) winds. Freedom is in the air. I wish these brave peoples the best, for they have fought hard and many have died struggling for political freedom.

Finally, it appears as though people throughout the Middle East are awakening from their [thirty-plus year](#) nightmare: corrupt, old regimes are being overthrown.

We have our own corrupt, old thirty-year regime to [overthrow](#) [nonviolently](#), of course.

Democrats and Republicans, our [government](#) in Washington (as well as many state and local governments) are nothing more than [criminal organizations](#), which need to be turned out - just like Mubarak, Qaddafi, et al.

How many US senators and representatives have been in Washington for the past thirty years or longer? They [need to be arrested](#), because they are guilty of committing and covering up [crimes against the American people](#).

[Wake up](#) from your [nightmare](#) my fellow Americans; we've many battles yet to wage in the coming days.

Would that this summer would be the summer of rage 2011; not that I don't prefer nonviolence, but governments rarely, if ever, loosen their grip on power without a fight. I'm not advocating starting a fight either, but I am advocating [finishing the fight](#) the government will likely start, IF we ever find the courage to face down the corrupt, thirty plus-year regime that now rules over us so poorly.

This book is a compilation of many of my essays—summer 2010 to spring 2011—that concern politics, society, law, and religion. Some of what I have written may sound familiar and some of it may not. I am not easy to pigeon-hole, politically. Concerning some issues I am very liberal, because the issue probably concerns the individual's right to do pretty much whatever she wants to do, so long as she's not bothering anyone (e.g., alcohol/drug use, sexual preferences), and to be left alone (to go unmolested) by neighbors, police, and government. But on some

issues I'm very conservative, because the issue probably concerns the individual's right to do pretty much whatever she wants to do, so long as she's not bothering anyone (e.g., property rights, gun ownership). In short, I am someone who is reasonably intelligent who has observed, studied, and meditated upon the American political experience for many, many years: from [1968](#)-present. There were [Days of Rage in 1968](#) too.

During that time, as you might imagine, I've seen quite a bit of political change in America, and throughout the world. 1968 was an eventful year, as I recall: the [Tet Offensive](#) began in South Vietnam, [protests](#) erupted on [campuses](#) throughout America ([and the world](#)) and many cities were plagued by [rioting](#), especially [after](#) Dr. [King was murdered](#) in Memphis, Tennessee. [Bobby Kennedy](#), who had pledged to end the [long, unwinnable war in South Vietnam](#), was also [murdered](#) that year, just a month after [Dr. King](#) was felled [by an assassin's bullet](#).

Many hopes were dashed in those days with the deaths-murders-of three, very important, visionary leaders: [John F. Kennedy](#) (Senator and US President), [Martin Luther King, Jr.](#) (social and religious leader), and [Robert F. Kennedy](#) (US Attorney General Senator and 1968 Democratic [candidate](#) for US President).

It's my hope that something I say will [trigger](#) something [inside the minds](#) of the American people, like the [detonator of a bomb](#) triggers an [explosion](#). It's up to the People of America to run their own affairs—i.e., to run our own country—which is a responsibility many Americans have [abandoned](#) long ago; over thirty years ago.

The corrupt [thirty-plus-year](#) regime in Washington needs to go, [now](#). A [plethora](#) of corruption and [criminal](#) charges exist against the political "[leadership](#)" of this nation, which include but are not limited to: [Afghanistan](#) (1979), [al Qaeda](#), [Iran-Contra](#), [continuity of government](#), [cocaine smuggling](#), [WTC bombing](#) (1993), [OKC bombing](#) (1995), [9/11/2001](#), [Afghanistan Iraq](#), [War on Terror](#), [USA PATRIOT ACT](#), [ATF gun running to Mexico](#) (2011).

Wake-Up From Your Nightmare . . .

I had a really bad dream last night. I saw someone die a sudden, brutal, and violent death. And I've seen enough of *that* in real life; I certainly don't need to see it in my dreams, too. Unfortunately, many people *will* die sudden, brutal, and violent deaths today. It bothers me that so many of these deaths are preventable (e.g., accidents), but what *really* bothers me—no, *angers* me—is that so many of these people will die *at the hands of people whose sole intention is to kill them*.

I guess this is a personal issue with me, because many people don't seem to be bothered by this at all. Perhaps I'm too sensitive?

The town I'm presently living in has a large Army supply depot located just outside the town's limits, and a lot of people who live in this town work there. In fact, the depot is (I think) the largest employer in town. And it's been very busy lately . . . ever since the wars began. Before then it was almost (literally) closed down. I imagine that if the wars ever ended virtually everyone who works there would be out of work. And there's not that many places in this town for someone to find work, other than the depot, especially these days.

I suppose *this* is the real issue we face in trying to end these wars: *too many American's currently depend on them for their livelihood*. I imagine that if I were ever to protest, locally, the wars, and this (local) depot's involvement in them, I would quickly become the most reviled person in town. I don't protest the wars locally, or the depot's involvement in them, (because my immediate family fears retaliation if I do, and I believe that I should respect their desire *not* to be involved) and so life, here, goes merrily on, just as the locals here would have it to go on: with most of the townsfolk busily involved in the task of supplying and resupplying our service men and women who (as the

locals put it) are "bravely and heroically fighting for our freedom, over there".

Personally, I could never be involved with any aspect of the military-industrial complex, which former president Eisenhower warned us about. But many people seem to be quite okay with it. When I was younger I did serve in the military, but I certainly want no parts of it today.

Because I have spoken out against the wars, locally, in writing, I've been accused (by some of the locals) of being un-American, and, since I'm also a veteran, I've even been told that I am now "a disgrace to the uniform".

There's a guy, here in town, who has a pick-up truck with "America: Love It or Leave It!" painted on his truck's tailgate. (I suppose every town in America has a guy with a truck like this though, right?) I first heard the expression "America: Love It or Leave It!" a very long time ago, during America's long war in Vietnam. I was too young to go to Vietnam; the war was over by the time that I had enlisted (1976), on my seventeenth birthday. I've had many friends and acquaintances who served in Vietnam, some of whom enjoyed their time over there (some a bit too much), many who did not enjoy their time over there, and many who were simply glad that the war had finally ended and that they had managed to make it back home, *alive*.

One of my friends, who served in the Marine Corps, had come back from Vietnam with a heroin addiction, which he was still dealing with (via Methadone) some thirty years after the war was over. He also had a serious drinking problem. He told me, once, that he'd been okay, mentally, until he had been ordered to shell a Vietnamese village which (he and everyone else knew) housed only innocent civilians. He (they) did, and he was still suffering the consequences of it some thirty years after the war had ended.

At least the dead are at peace.

I've been fortunate in that I have never been responsible for anyone's death. And for that I thank God, for his grace and for his mercy. As I said, I've seen many people die a sudden, brutal, and violent death. Only one occurred while I was in the military; all of the others I saw on the highways of America. I drove a truck for twenty years and, as you can imagine, you see a lot of death and a lot of destruction when you travel the highways for many, many years. I actually had to quit driving, because I just couldn't take it anymore. I was living in Little Rock, Arkansas at the time and there was one particular mile-long stretch of Interstate 30, during a period of one week, on which five people died (suddenly, brutally and violently), including a woman and her young child, who ended up beneath a tractor-trailer after hitting it head-on. I'll tell you what . . . after all that I'd already seen during all of those years of driving (especially, by this time, this woman and her young child, underneath that truck), it wasn't long after that one particularly gruesome week in Little Rock that I decided to give up driving (every day, and for a living) for good.

I simply couldn't take it any longer.

It always seems like a sacred moment to me, whenever I see someone die an especially sudden, brutal, and violent death . . . like a sacred moment in time. Whatever it was that had led to these deaths (in my case, these were all accidental deaths) seemed very incidental to me. The deadly moment seemed, to me, very mysterious; holy, somehow. What chain of events had led to this particular and deadly moment for this person? What could someone have possibly done in order to have avoided this deadly moment? Anything? Was it, in some mysterious way, beyond anyone's control? To me, it certainly seemed so. Or was there something (anything) that someone could have done in order to have prevented the tragedy? I know that I've prayed many prayers—hundreds—for the loved ones that I knew would soon hear those terrible words: that their daughter, their son, their wife, their husband, their mother, or their father had died.

I leave those mysteries, regarding the moments and incidences of people's deaths, to God; who certainly knows much better than do I why they occurred when they occurred. Accidents are one thing, but the *intentional* brutal and violent destruction of a human life is something altogether different. Intentional acts of this sort enter the realm of moral evil. Not that I'm a pacifist, because I'm not. I believe we have the right—the obligation—to defend ourselves and innocents from evildoers who seek to do us (and them) bodily harm. But war, for instance, must be justified along these same lines: *as a defense* against those who would do us harm. War is the worst of evils, and the very last of resorts. The current wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, however, do *not* meet this (just war) criteria. The US is in fact the invader—the evildoer—in *both* of these instances.

I can't imagine being responsible—whether directly or indirectly—for the brutal and violent destruction of someone's wife, husband, daughter, son, mother, or father. Yet how many of the people who are returning (or will return) from Iraq and Afghanistan, and how many of those people who work at supplying and resupplying our troops, will have the inescapable feeling that *they have innocent blood on their hands* which, except for the forgiveness that comes only through Christ, can *never* be removed? How many people, thirty years from now, will lament and brood over the day they followed an "order" to shred, into bloody pieces, innocent peoples in the name of "freedom"? How will they pay their debt to the dead?

I shudder to think about it.

I hope the VA has a good program for PTSD and substance abuse, because they're going to need it; for many years to come.

But why is it that things are so out-of-wack in America anyway? Why is that that people in the US military, ever since Vietnam, have been "ordered" to kill innocent people in the name of "freedom"? What's

wrong with America? What's wrong with the American people and our government?

Well, there's a very easy-yet a very disturbing-answer to these questions. And the answer lies in the distant, although not too distant, past. In fact, it lies somewhere within the very first memories that I have as a human person: the [assassination](#), in November 1963, of then US President John F. Kennedy.

Anyone who is old enough to remember 9/11, and the impact the events of that day had upon their memory, can certainly imagine the impact the event of President Kennedy's assassination must have had upon those who can remember it-the event is indelibly etched upon the minds of those people who lived through that experience.

I was very young (almost four years old) when President Kennedy was assassinated, but I *do* remember it; like it was yesterday.

My first memory of that event is both powerful and unusual. I remember being on my dad's shoulders, at night, waiting and watching for something; although I didn't know what. In the midst of a small group, of perhaps twenty people, we stood beside a high fence, in the darkness and in silence, and we watched as a Navy (i.e., Marine Corps) [helicopter](#) was landing, and it seemed, to me, in the darkness, that fire was somehow coming from its engines. A battleship grey, US Navy Cadillac ambulance was waiting nearby the helicopter landing pad (at the [Bethesda Naval Hospital](#)) and, from my perch, high upon my dad's shoulders, I watched as men silently rolled a hospital gurney (upon which lay a body, with a white sheet covering it) from the helicopter toward the open rear door of the ambulance. I remember people crying, sobbing, but I didn't know why. Someone, probably my dad, told me that it was President Kennedy.

Until now (and I am now fifty years old) I never really understood the full meaning of that day, and of that event.

I have other, also very clear, memories of Kennedy's assassination as well: being in Washington (on my dad's shoulders again) amidst a sea of people, hoping to view President Kennedy's body, which was lying in state in the rotunda of the Capitol building; the (very somber) funeral, with its riderless horse and the "rider's" empty boots placed backward in the stirrups, which was televised to the nation (in those days, on black and white TV) and which interrupted (to my four year old bewilderment) my regularly scheduled cartoons; visiting Arlington Cemetery and seeing the eternal flame at Kennedy's gravesite, surrounded by four hats, each hat representing one branch of the four armed services.

Looking back on that event today—almost fifty years later—I think: "Yeah, that's very ironic, isn't it? The four branches of *the armed services*? Why not include hats representing the various branches of America's *secret intelligence agencies* too? But I suppose they don't have hats, do they?" Ironic, too, how militaristic the slain president's state funeral was.

It seems that Kennedy, much to the consternation of the leaders of the armed services (namely, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, at the time) was far too much of a peacemaker (or, a peace seeker) for the hawks in the military and the secret intelligence services, especially since this was, at the time, the very *height* of the Cold War (e.g., after the Bay of Pigs and the Cuban Missile Crisis). The militaristic hawks thought that Kennedy should have chosen to *dominate* the (Soviet) enemy with overwhelming force (called today: Full Spectrum Dominance), via nuclear weapons. And for choosing not to do so (thereby saving the world, as we know it), and for choosing instead to pursue a course of peace, life, and humanity, President Kennedy was murdered, in Dallas—as a traitor—by the hawks within the US military and the US secret intelligence agencies.

The assassination of another peacemaker—the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.—I have much clearer memories of, because I was, by then, much older (I was eight years old). I remember well King's

funeral, and the contrast between Kennedy's riderless horse (which I remembered, clearly) and King's simple pine coffin, which was carried by a mule-drawn cart. Apparently, the same sorts of people (the militarist hawks) were involved with King's murder too; as they were with the murder of Kennedy's brother, Robert, another peace seeker, who was shot to death in Los Angeles, only a month after Dr. King had been gunned-down while standing on the balcony of the Lorraine Motel in Memphis, Tennessee in April 1968.

It would seem that the militaristic hawks have a thing for guns, doesn't it? As well as for gunning-down those leaders—*true leaders*— who dare to cross them; and who attempt to foil their bloody, warmongering agenda.

Well I, for one, have no respect for these militaristic hawks—whose legacies remain in power today. Nor will I ever be afraid to stick my neck out (or my head) in order to thwart their ungodly, murderous agenda and to take a stand for life, peace, and humanity. As I said before, I'm not a pacifist—I believe in self defense—but there has never been a good reason (i.e., a *just* reason) for Americans to have gone to war *at anytime* during the past fifty years; including (especially) the events of 9/11, which is the reason (excuse) that's always given for the on-going carnage in Iraq, Afghanistan, and now Pakistan.

Question: Who do you think had the most to gain from the events of 9/11? The American people, perhaps? Or maybe the enlisted members of the US armed services? Or perhaps it was the Iraqi, Afghani, and Pakistani peoples? Perhaps—in reality—it was the militaristic hawks, at it again, beginning a new (21st century) era of fear and warmongering; those who occupy high-level positions within the US military and the various US secret intelligence agencies? (Not to mention certain *civilian* "leaders", like former (chicken-hawk) Vice President Richard Cheney.) Perhaps they felt the need, as these militarist hawks so often do, to dominate "the enemy"; as opposed to

pursuing a course of peace? Granted, it's much easier, I suppose, to see "the enemy"—especially when your desire is to *kill him*—as [an inanimate object](#), as opposed to seeing him as a fellow human being. But this militaristic approach doesn't—in reality—remove from "the enemy" his humanity, does it?

Could it be? Could it be that all of those people, in the town that I now live in—all of those people who work at that Army depot—are actually *supporting* the same, insidious, murderous [military-industrial](#) militaristic hawk-complex that's truly responsible for assassinating [President John F. Kennedy](#), the [Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.](#) and [Robert F. Kennedy](#)? The same [military-industrial](#) militarist hawk-complex that's responsible for killing thousands of people in Vietnam, thousands of people on 9/11, thousands of people in Afghanistan, thousands of people in Iraq, and who, today, are intent on killing *millions* more, via nuclear weapons, in a [foolhardy](#) attempt to initiate, in the Middle East, ([in league with Israel](#) against "our enemies" Iran and its allies: Russia and China) a new and third [World War](#)? And all the while, the best thing that the majority of the American people seem to be able to say is: "America: Love It or Leave It!"?

Please, say it ain't so . . .

But I suppose these people *do* need their jobs; right? I know they have bills to pay, kids to feed, and (many) trips to [Wal-Mart](#) to make. I know they need to work; who doesn't? But is being involved with *killing people*—people who have done us no harm whatsoever—the *only* (or even the *best*) job that we can do? Do we not have a [conscience](#)? A human conscience, which tells us when we are doing something wrong? Are we so brainwashed—yes: [brainwashed](#)—that we believe, unthinkingly, all of the lies that our government has told us concerning these [wars](#) and the events of [9/11](#)?

For the love of God people . . . please, wake up!

I'm on my knees, begging you. Seek life, seek peace, and seek humanity.

You're breaking my heart . . . and I really don't have much of a heart left to break.

Propaganda and the People

One of the most important books I've ever read is Jacques Ellul's [Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes](#). Ellul was a French Resistance fighter during World War II and his study of propaganda concentrates on the Nazi's methods of propaganda. Although the book is somewhat dated (it was published in 1973), the methods of propaganda he examines haven't really changed at all, because they still work, and governments continue to use these same methods, which the Nazi's used so many years ago.

[Ellul](#) is one of the greatest thinkers of our time; therefore he was very well able to analyze propaganda—unlike most people, who are so easily taken in by propaganda.

To most people, the word *propaganda* has negative connotations, because we think of how lies have been perpetrated via propaganda, but the word *propaganda* simply describes a certain *type* of speech: propagandistic speech; the word itself has neither negative nor positive connotations. *Propaganda* is certainly *persuasive* speech, but then *all speech is persuasive* to some degree; if it weren't, we wouldn't bother *speaking* (or *writing*) at all.

What I find most interesting about propaganda is how blatantly—shamelessly—persuasive it is. During World War II, the United States shamelessly portrayed our enemy, the Japanese people, as sub-human, [rodent-like](#) creatures. Why? So that our soldiers could find it easier to kill (i.e., exterminate) them and so that the citizens of the U. S. could support such killing.

Does anyone in the U. S. today still believe that the Japanese people are sub-human, rodent-like creatures? Yet the overwhelming majority of Americans during World War II did think of the Japanese people this way.

What's changed? The war eventually ended; the war-fever eventually subsided; and the American people eventually came back to their senses.

Now apply this same scenario—the use of wartime propaganda—to ourselves and our situation today. Today we are at war with the terrorists, and ever since September 11, 2001, the American people (and the entire world) have been given, by their government in Washington, a very simple choice: "Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists."

Obviously no one wants to be "with the terrorists," do they? So we default to an unthinking, flag waving support of our nation, during its time of war: the "War on Terror".

Ever since September 11, 2001 we have been subjected to propagandistic imagery, which no American thinks of as being "bad", even though it's obviously propagandistic, which represents our "standing with America" against our enemies: "the terrorists". We've also been deluged by pro-war rhetoric from our politicians (of both political parties) as well as from our media—especially our television news media.

I'm saying all of this in order to make one, simple point and to ask you one, simple question: "Have you been so taken in by this propaganda that you have suspended your critical thinking?"

In order to help you to figure this out, I'll ask you a few, simple questions:

Do you still believe—nine years after 9/11—that supporting the (unending) "War on Terror" is the right thing for American citizens to be doing?

Do you still believe—nine years after 9/11—that the "War on Terror" makes America a safer place?

Do you still believe—nine years after 9/11—that detaining (indefinitely) and torturing people who are suspected of being or supporting terrorists—including

people who are U. S. citizens—is the right thing for our government to be doing?

Do you still believe—nine years after 9/11—that the U. S. military is in Afghanistan in order to hunt-down Osama bin Laden and take-out al Qaeda?

Do you still believe—nine years after 9/11—that our government was telling the American people the truth about Iraq's having weapons of mass destruction?

Do you still believe—nine years after 9/11—that the USA PATRIOT ACT was (and still is) a good thing for the American people?

Do you still believe—nine years after 9/11—that the U. S. has a right to invade any nation it deems to be a threat, even if the people of that nation have never harmed us in any way?

If you answered "yes" to any of these questions, you have been taken-in (i.e., *duped*) by the Washington government's propaganda.

Being take-in or duped by someone is okay, we've all been fooled by someone at one time or another in our lives, it's part and parcel of being human; but once our eyes have been opened, and once we realize that we've been deceived, we shouldn't allow ourselves to be so easily fooled again.

The most important lesson I came away with from Jacques Ellul's fascinating book on propaganda was this: When a government wishes to accomplish something that's on its agenda, but the government doesn't have the popular, public support it needs in order to implement this "something", the government creates "a crisis" for which this "something" is then set then forth as being "the solution" to "the crisis".

Did you get that? The government's "solution"—meaning some part of the government's unpopular agenda—comes first; then the government's assertion that a "crisis" exists comes afterwards. This is the

means to the ends that the government wishes—with popular, public support—to attain.

Governments—including our government in Washington—will often use the media, especially the television news media, to communicate to us the existence of a manufactured “crisis” in order to gain popular, public support for a particular aspect of the government’s agenda.

One, recent example of this is the “crisis” in health care. I’m fifty years old and I can assure you that—throughout my lifetime—health care has *always* been expensive, because health care is a very highly skilled *kind* of care that is very labor intensive. Has the cost of health care gone up? Of course it has. But so has the cost of everything else, yet you never hear about a “crisis” in, let’s say, the cost of postage stamps, do you? When I was a child, a postage stamp cost five cents, but today a postage stamp costs forty-four cents. The price of a Hershey’s chocolate bar was also five cents when I was a child, yet today you’ll pay upwards of one dollar for a Hershey’s chocolate bar.

If there’s a crisis in anything in America today it’s the crisis of the Washington government’s fiscal irresponsibility: inflationary deficit spending, which (inevitably) causes the prices of *everything* we buy (e.g., health care, postage stamps, candy bars) to rise—slowly, but ever so surely. But we never hear about that, do we? The Washington government wants us to believe that inflation is *always* under control; that it’s *never* in crisis. The *real* crises are *hidden* from the public, whereas the *manufactured* crises are *foisted*—via the government/media propaganda machine—upon the public.

Has our attitude been formed—shaped—by the Washington government’s propaganda? Is it being shaped by it, even now?

If we are unaware of the insidious influence that propaganda has on our—or any—society, Jacques Ellul tells us that we will certainly be influenced by it;

most often without our even realizing that we are being influenced by it.

It's time for the American people to wake up to this fact.

When it comes to the threat—or the perceived threat—of terrorism, the United States has perceived a growing threat of terrorism for many years now. In short, for those of us who are old enough to remember, and for those of us who have been paying attention, the threat of Islamic—or Middle East—terrorism is really nothing new.

Through the late 1960's and the 1970's, I can remember many incidences of Middle Eastern (i.e., Arab/Palestinian) terrorism making the news, repeatedly. But it wasn't until 1979—when the [Islamic Revolution occurred in Iran](#)—that the U. S. government became extremely concerned with a new threat: [Islamic terrorism](#). By 1980, the U. S. had allied itself with Iran's enemy, the secular Saddam Hussein's (Sunni) Iraq, in hope that war between these two countries would result in the defeat of the Islamic Revolutionaries in Iran. War did occur, and the [war was brutal](#), including the use of poison gases by Iraq, which were supplied by the U. S., lasting from 1980-1988 and resulting in a stalemate, with Iran having suffered the worst of the casualties.

Throughout the 1980's, Washington grew ever more concerned with the new-Islamic-terror threat. Iran had supported the ([Shia](#)) Islamic terrorist group [Hezbollah](#), which was formed in Lebanon in 1982, in its attacks against its enemy: Israel. In 1983, the U. S. had sent troops into Lebanon (siding with Israel) in an attempt at peacekeeping (Israel had invaded Lebanon in 1982) and Hezbollah responded to this U. S. involvement in Lebanon by launching suicide truck bomb attacks against the [U. S. embassy and the U. S. Marine Corps barracks in Beirut](#), which resulted in the loss of 241 American lives. There were also multiple Islamic terror related kidnappings of many Americans living and working in the Middle East during the 1980's, as well as the infamous 1988

bombing of [Pan Am flight 103](#) over Lockerbie, Scotland, which took the lives of 270 people.

During this same time period (the 1980's) the Soviet Union had, in 1979, invaded Afghanistan and continued to occupy it until finally leaving that country in 1989. The U. S. supported the Afghan rebels--or freedom fighters, as they were called in those days--against our enemy the Soviet Union. The war in Afghanistan was, in reality, a proxy war between the U. S. and the U. S. S. R., much like Vietnam War had had been years earlier, with the Soviets backing the North Vietnamese against the U. S. When the war in Afghanistan ended in 1989, the U. S., having achieved the results it wanted--a Soviet defeat--immediately cut its ties with Afghanistan leaving the people of that country to pick up the pieces of their broken lives without the help of their former ally: the U. S.

If we want to truly understand the terror attacks of September 11, 2001 and the War on Terror which followed, we need to understand Afghanistan after 1989. In the later years of the Afghan war, the [Mujahideen](#), or Afghan freedom fighters, were being fully funded and supported by the U. S. through its intelligence agencies, and by the time that the U. S. finally pulled its funding and support out of Afghanistan in 1989 the U. S. had helped to fund, support and create an insurgent Islamic army of jihadists that no longer had a Soviet enemy to fight; thereby creating a phenomenon that scholar Chalmers Johnson has referred to as [blowback](#).

The Soviet Union had come to an end by 1991 and the United States government was soon declaring itself to be the new, lone superpower. But although the Soviet Union had collapsed, the threat of Islamic terrorism, thanks to the war in Afghanistan, had now become a much greater threat.

In relation to thinking about how propaganda functions, and about how the War on Terror has been sold to us as a response to the terror attacks of 9/11, let's look at what the Washington government

knew about the newest Islamist terrorist group to arise during the early 1990's, which came out of the Afghan Mujahideen and was led by a man named Osama bin Laden, which was called: al Qaeda; meaning: The Base.

The official excuse which the Washington government has given us for its inability to prevent the deaths of nearly 3,000 American citizens on September 11, 2001 is: "We never saw this coming." But from [1981 until 2006](#), according to five-time Emmy Award-winning investigative journalist [Peter Lance](#), who has written [three books](#) on the subject of 9/11, what follows is only a *partial* list of what the Washington government did in fact know about the al Qaeda Islamic terrorist threat and the danger that it posed to U. S. citizens—*long before 9/11*:

- They knew Ali Mohamed, a member of al Qaeda and a Foreign Counter Intelligence agent, who was working with the U. S. government, was training al Qaeda terrorists in New York in 1992.
- They knew about, infiltrated, and assisted the al Qaeda cell that planned and executed the *first* attack on the World Trade Center (i.e., the [bombing](#) of the WTC in 1993) *before* it happened.
- They knew that Ali Mohamed traveled to Nairobi, Kenya in order to do surveillance on the U. S. embassy located there in preparation for a future al Qaeda terrorist attack (the [bombing](#) of which actually occurred in 1998, killing 213 people).

- They knew Ali Mohamed traveled to Khartoum, Sudan, in 1993, in order to arrange a terror summit between (Sunni) al Qaeda and (Shiite) Hezbollah leaders, including Osama bin Laden, which led to the Khobar Towers [bombing](#) (Saudi Arabia) in 1996, and facilitated the future Sunni-Shiite insurgency alliance in Iraq (2003).
- They knew, in 1993, that Ali Mohamed was training al-Qaeda terrorists how to hijack commercial airliners.
- They knew, in 1995, that terror mastermind [Ramzi Yousef](#), and his uncle, [Khalid Sheikh Mohamed](#), were planning to use airliners as missiles; plotting to hijack and then [crash](#) commercial airliners into buildings (e.g., the Transamerica building, the Sears Tower, the Pentagon, and the World Trade Center towers) in the U. S.
- They knew, in 1995, that terror mastermind Ramzi Yousef, and his uncle, Khalid Sheikh Mohamed, were planning to [blow up](#) a dozen airliners over the Pacific by using small, easily concealed, liquid-based, time-activated bombs, which were to be placed near the center fuel tanks of Boeing 747's, causing the airliners' fuel (and the airliner itself) to explode.
- They knew, in 1995, that Ali Mohamed had gotten Ayman al-Zawahiri (al Qaeda's number-two man) into the U. S. for an al Qaeda fundraising tour; the purpose of which was to raise funds for the [bombing](#) of the Egyptian embassy in Pakistan.

- They knew that Oklahoma City bomber [Terry Nichols](#) had been in contact with al Qaeda members in the Philippines *before* the [bombing](#) of the Murrah federal building on April 19, 1995.
- They knew al Qaeda was planning to blow up a U. S. airliner, via a small, liquid-based, time-activated bomb, which was to be placed near the center fuel tank of a Boeing 747 (in order to cause a mistrial) during terror mastermind Ramzi Yousef's federal trial in New York City, during July 1996. (This event actually *did* occur, when [TWA flight 800](#) blew up in mid-air just after taking off (bound for Paris, France) from JFK International airport (Long Island, New York) on July 17, 1996, killing all 230 people on-board; including [an entire high school French Club](#), from Pennsylvania, who were on their way to Paris; killing sixteen students and five adults).
- They knew of, and were monitoring, the al Qaeda cell (in Africa) that was plotting to [bomb](#), simultaneously, the U. S. embassies in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania in 1998 (killing 224 people and injuring thousands) *before* it happened.
- They knew, during late 1999-early 2000, that al Qaeda held a meeting (in the [Philippines](#)) to plan the execution of terror mastermind Ramzi Yousef's (9/11 style) airliners-as-missiles plot.

- They knew, in 2000, that two of the 9/11 hijackers had entered the U. S. and that they were living in a room they had rented from an FBI informant in San Diego, California.
- They knew of, and were monitoring, in 2000, at least four of the 9/11 hijackers who were then living in the U. S., including lead hijacker Mohamed Atta, whose picture was also included in a link chart, which was produced by Defense Intelligence Agency analysts (the results of a vast data-mining project which they had developed).

Do you still believe—even after reading this partial list—that the Washington government “never saw this coming”?

As for the War on Terror, which followed the 9/11 attacks, let’s look beyond the propaganda and ask: What are the **lies** and what are the **truths** concerning it, and what do you now—nine years since 9/11—still believe about it? Have you bought-into the propaganda? Do you want to know the truth beyond the propaganda?

Lie: “The War on Terror is keeping Americans safe by protecting us from al Qaeda terrorist attacks.”

Truth: “The odds that we might be killed in a terrorist attack in America are truly astronomical; something like winning the power ball twice in a row. Even ‘if terrorists were to destroy entirely one of America’s 40,000 shopping malls per week, your chances of being there at the wrong time would be about one in one million or more . . . [even] if terrorists hijacked and crashed one of America’s 18,000 commercial flights per week . . . your chance of being on the crashed plane would be one in 135,000.’” *Reason Magazine* August 11, 2006 (See the full article [here](#)).

The fact is that we are in virtually no danger of being killed in an al Qaeda terrorist attack. And this is not because the War on Terror is keeping us safe, it's simply because the odds of our being killed in a terrorist attack (of any kind) are just so astronomically high. And the price that we pay—sacrificing our individual freedoms and liberties—for this supposed 'safety' is far too high.

Because of the current "Hot War" that America has begun in the Middle East and Afghanistan, it is in fact *far more likely* that the American homeland is now at greater risk of nuclear attack by our enemies: China and Russia, who are allied with Iran, than it ever was during the "Cold War".

Lie: "We can succeed in Afghanistan."

Truth: "History tells us that Afghanistan has always repelled outside invaders; and we are simply fools to believe that we can succeed were all other have failed. A fundamental rule of warfare is: don't stretch your supply lines too thin, yet this is exactly what we are doing in Afghanistan and Iraq.

"'I would like to push closer to the border, but I can only go as far as I can support,' said Lt. Col. Michael Martin, commanding officer of 4th Marine Division, 4th Light Armored Reconnaissance Battalion . . . Like Napoleon, you don't want to overextend your capabilities, or you will get your butt handed to you,' said Martin, whose troops are spread out among a handful of patrol bases along the Helmand River, marking the coalition's most southern presence in the province."

A fiscally bankrupt nation/empire (like America), which has its military spread out across the globe in a futile attempt to control the resources of foreign nations (like Iraq and Afghanistan), is a nation/empire that is destined to collapse.

Propaganda is a very powerful tool in the hands of a very powerful government and we should not be so dubious as to believe everything that our government

in Washington tells us to believe. It has an agenda, and we are fools if we think that it doesn't. And we are fools if we think our government will not use whatever means it thinks are necessary in order to move that agenda forward by influencing, through propaganda, U. S. public opinion.

In 2000, an out-of-power group of pseudo-intellectual [chickenhawks](#) devised a strategy in which they envisioned a new, hegemonic American empire that would sit astride the world; something like a new Roman Empire. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, the threat of Islamic terrorism, the rise of China, and the chance to (finally) make a grab for the Middle East oil fields, which the Soviet Union had long feared the U. S. would make, this neo-conservative, think-tank cabal, the [Project for a New American Century](#)—most of the members of which having held positions of power in previous administrations (e.g., Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz)—outlined their plan for a new, American hegemonic dominance of the world and its resources through brute (brutal) military strength: [Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century](#).

The document outlined their plan to take advantage of superior U. S. military strength in order to dominate and intimidate the world and to control its resources. To the members of this power-hungry cabal, there was only one, small problem with this agenda: the American people would never support it, nor would any of our allies. But they knew exactly what they needed to do in order to get public opinion to endorse their new plan for America: create "a crisis" for which their plan was to be "the solution".

In their own words, from the document outlining their plan, which was mentioned above:

"A transformation strategy that solely pursued capabilities for projecting force from the United States, for example, and sacrificed forward basing and presence, would be at odds with larger American policy goals and would trouble American allies. Further, the process of transformation, even if it

brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event—like a new Pearl Harbor.” [Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century](#), 2000, p.51.

The “terrorist” attacks of September 11, 2001 were the realization of this “catastrophic and catalyzing event”, “a new Pearl Harbor”, and it was an event that was carefully overseen and orchestrated every step of the way by those who sought to assert U. S. military dominance around the globe, especially in the Middle East: those corrupt political, intelligence, and military officials—drunk with power—who have burrowed their way into what has become the ungodly, criminal corporate, military, government, symbiotic entity that now poses as our legitimate government in Washington D. C.

Wake up America, see through the propaganda, and begin taking back your government from these criminals—for the People—now!

9/11 - America's Open Wound

I was accused, recently, in a letter to the editor of the [Public Opinion](#), which was titled: [Essayist's points make no sense](#) (September 13, 2010), of making nonsensical points in an essay that I had written, which had been published previously in the Public Opinion ([September 3, 2010](#)). The point, which I made in the essay and which this letter-writer took issue with, was this: That I believe elements of our own government were responsible for the terror attacks of [September 11, 2001](#).

I realize this is not something one hears on the nightly news, but it's hardly nonsensical. Consider the following news story, which concerns a recent press conference held by the group [Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth](#), that took place at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. on the ninth anniversary of the 9/11 terror attacks:

WASHINGTON, Sept. 7 /[PRNewswire-USNewswire](#)/ --
On Thursday September 9, 2010

[1,270 Architects/Engineers Reveal Hard Evidence of Explosive Demolition at World Trade Center on 9/11](#)

Former US Senator [Mike Gravel](#) (D-AK) and [Richard Gage](#), AIA, Founder of Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth Discuss Scientific Findings - National Press Club, Washington DC, 2:00 pm, Thursday, September 9, 2010

"Gravel and Gage will host a central press conference at the National Press Club in Washington, DC, presenting hard evidence that all [three](#) WTC skyscrapers on September 11, 2001, in NYC were destroyed by explosive controlled demolition.

Senator Gravel notes, "Critically important evidence has come forward *after* the original government building reports were completed."

Have you heard about this? I don't think Gravel and Gage are talking nonsense. Do you? After all, architects and engineers are usually some of the most scientifically-minded and fact-based people that one would ever want to meet. They're hardly the type of people given to making nonsensical statements, especially in public . . . at the National Press Club no less.

I think the real question we need to ask ourselves is: Why did they feel the need to do so in the first place? Because there's a media blackout concerning the many questions surrounding the horrific events of 9/11 that still remain unanswered?

Peter Lance, a five-time Emmy award-winning journalist, answers this question for us, in great detail, in his book: Cover-Up: What the Government Is Still Hiding About the War on Terror (New York: Harper, 2005). *Cover-Up* is Lance's second of three books that he has written on the subject of the 9/11 cover-up. Is he just writing nonsense too? Lance doesn't go so far as to say that 9/11 was an inside job, although I think it obvious, Lance simply wants a new (real) investigation into the events of 9/11, allowing the chips to fall wherever they may, as do I.

I'm of the opinion that citizenship requires involvement and taking responsibility for government, not a blind obedience to government regardless of how corrupt that government has now become.

Is any of this making sense to you? Is it nonsensical? I think it's not only sensible to believe that 9/11 was an inside job, I think the inside job argument makes the most sense out of the plethora of information that we now have available to us about the terror attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001. After all, our government has been known to have done this sort of thing before—

staging "[incidents](#)" in order to gain public support for its latest military venture (e.g., the [USS Maine](#), the [RMS Lusitania](#), [Pearl Harbor](#), [Operation Northwoods](#), the [Gulf of Tonkin](#)).

9/11 is America's [open wound](#). The only way this wound can heal is for the truth to come out, no matter how [ugly](#) the truth about 9/11 turns out to be.

I'm not the only person in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, the US, or the world who believes this either . . . far from it.

There are numerous [9/11 Truth groups](#) that can be found throughout all fifty states, and many, many more that can be found in nations throughout the world.

[Nonsensical?](#)

Rather, the American people are beginning to wake up from their government controlled, [mass media](#) induced slumber.

The Roman Lawyers Against the Washington Politicians

I've mentioned the concept of [natural law](#) many times previously; most notably: natural law as [the basis of the civil rights movement](#) led by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; [Rand Paul's apparent ignorance](#) of natural law; and [Joe Biden's contempt](#) for natural law regarding the threat it poses to Roe v. Wade.

America has gotten away from its natural law foundations, which had been the foundation of western civilization and jurisprudence for well over 2,000 years.

America's natural law foundations are most evident in its [Declaration of Independence](#):

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Legal theorists in America today reject natural law, as do the Washington politicians; preferring to assert the authority of positive law *alone*. But positive law, which is simply the legal decisions of a legislature or court, must, according to natural law theory, live up to natural law. Positive law cannot function properly in isolation from the context of natural law.

As Dr. King [pointed out](#), many years ago, quoting [St. Augustine](#): "an unjust law is no law at all." In short, a positive law that violates the natural law and the moral laws of the universe is a "law" that is null and void. Positive law—the laws passed by legislatures and decided by court decisions—must uphold natural law in order to be valid.

America, especially Washington D. C., intentionally resembles—politically, governmentally, judicially, and even architecturally—the ancient Roman Empire, because Roman political theory, which was based upon natural law, was deemed the best political model upon which to base the young nation of the New World.

"[N]one of the [Roman] lawyers doubted that there is a higher law than the enactments of any particular state. Like Cicero, they conceived of the law as ultimately rational, universal, unchangeable, and divine, at least in respect to the main principles of right and justice. The Roman Law, like the English common law, was only in small part a product of legislation. Hence the presumption was never made that law expresses nothing but the will of a competent legislative body, which is an idea of quite recent origin. It was assumed that 'nature' sets certain norms which the positive law must live up to as best it can and that, as Cicero had believed, an 'unlawful' statute simply is not law. Throughout the whole of the Middle Ages and well down into modern times the existence and the validity of such a higher law were taken for granted." (George H. Sabine: A History of Political Theory, pp. 169-170)

Law is not—or *should not* be—simply the bare expression of *the will* of any legislative or judicial body.

There are two—and only two—legal and philosophical theories available today: *the will to power* (positive law alone) and *the universally accepted moral law* (positive law that does its best to *live up to* the natural law).

As Dr. King said, "A just law is a man-made code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law."

The Roman conception of natural law paralleled the rise of Christianity but it was not dependent upon it. And the American conception of natural law

entails neither the acceptance nor the endorsement of Christianity.

"It should be noted that these [natural law-based] reforms in the Roman Law, though they were completed after the beginning of the Christian era, were not due to Christianity." (ibid, p. 171)

In these postmodern times it might seem unfathomable, intellectually, to argue for America's return to its natural law foundations. But the only alternative we have to natural law is, as I said above: the will to power. The will to power is America's current legal and philosophical foundation, which is why America's legal and political system is currently broken.

There's an old and true saying: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." Likewise, it stands to reason that "If it is broke, fix it."

America is broken because it has abandoned its natural law foundation.

Dr. King's civil rights movement would be rejected today on the grounds that he had no right to assert his personal belief in natural law as an eternal, inviolable, and transcendent standard to which all positive legislation must do its best to live up to and to which all Americans must be held. Dr. King would be accused of asserting his personal will and interpretation over against the wills and interpretation of other Americans who disagreed with him.

His movement, today, would degenerate into a battle of wills and a battle of powers.

But the will to power is a dead end street.

Although it's often said that "we can't turn back the clock" we can, if we're trying to get somewhere—like toward a more just society—get America back on *the right track* if we've gotten ourselves on a *wrong track*.

The will to power is a wrong track for America to be on. And the will to power is nothing new either. It's not some new, postmodern philosophical development; it's simply the same old personal, Sophistic interpretation of justice that Socrates—and the Roman lawyers—rejected centuries ago.

Although the will to power might be a valid, even if wrong, philosophical position to take, *it simply does not work* in the day to day dealings of peoples who are living in a society that seeks to promote the common good of all. The will to power is, in fact, contrary to social harmony.

Is it any wonder then that America is adrift today? By casting off the legal anchor of natural law America has crashed upon the shoals of the will to power; and American is nigh unto being totally destroyed if we fail to return our great nation to the natural law foundation upon which it was built.

The Public Safety Exception

We're hearing a lot of talk lately about the so-called [public safety exception](#). And it should come as no surprise to us that, once again, the federal government wants to interpret (i.e., distort the meaning of) the law in its favor.

In the name of the (unending) Global War on Terror, of course.

It seems that the Obama administration now wants to be able to arrest and detain U. S. citizens suspected in acts of terrorism without first reading them their Miranda rights and without producing them in court, promptly, for arraignment.

Once again, [our rights are disappearing](#). But I suppose that most Americans look at it this way: "Hey, if you're not doing anything wrong, then you don't have anything to worry about do you? . . . Can you please stop bothering me? I'm trying to watch the game . . ."

The so-called public exception clause to [Miranda v. Arizona](#), the case which gave us the protection of being informed of our rights upon our being arrested, comes from the U. S. Supreme Court case of [New York v. Quarles](#), in which the court stated that, in certain circumstances, in which public safety is a concern, evidence that is obtained by police officers before the suspect is read his Miranda rights can be allowed as evidence at the suspect's trial. In particular, the evidence that was obtained, in this case, was a gun; a suspect with an empty shoulder holster having been asked by police "Where is the gun?" This is somewhat reasonable, because the police officer was concerned with his own safety at that moment. Once the suspect told police where the gun was, he was arrested and read his Miranda rights. The gun was allowed as evidence in court.

Perhaps, technically, the gun should not have been allowed as evidence. But then people who commit

crimes should know not to tell the police anything, especially the location of the evidence of their crimes.

This public safety exception to Miranda allows only for a very small window of time before the suspect is read his rights, and not the indefinite window of time the Obama administration is now seeking.

Once again, the federal government is seeking new ways to rid us of our rights. No doubt the public exception will now be expanded, in the name of the (unending) Global War on Terror, to include an indefinite amount of time between the time of a suspect's arrest and their arraignment before a judge in order to allow sufficient time for interrogation and interrogation methods.

But this was precisely what Miranda v. Arizona is supposed to prevent: a suspect being interrogated without being told first that they have the right to remain silent, that anything they say can and will be used against them in court, that they have the right to an attorney to be present before questioning, and that if they cannot afford an attorney one will be appointed for them.

In short, the federal government now wants to get rid of these rights.

But hey, the Obama administration has already decided that it can assassinate U. S. citizens anyway. So who cares, right?

"Please be quiet . . . I'm trying to watch the game . . ."

Perhaps you don't fear being arrested, or what may happen to you if you are. But you should.

It's not always "the bad guys" who get arrested you know. Sometimes innocent people get arrested too.

These days, the bad guys are being defined rather nebulously as "terror suspects". But what do those words mean anyway? Terror? Suspects?

In America, *suspects* have rights. And *terror* can, eventually, be defined-down to fit practically anyone (e.g., political activists, dissidents, agitators, reporters, journalists, sympathizers, printers, bloggers).

Perhaps even a fourteen year old autistic kid who draws a picture of a gun.

Governments always begin by first removing these rights from those of whom we might not approve (Jews, communists, criminals, terrorists), but we will, eventually, find that everyone has lost their rights. Which is why we should be concerned about terror suspects losing theirs. If they do, then we've really lost ours.

Shame and 9/11 Truth

I was [protesting](#) the wars at the Pentagon a couple of weeks ago and, strangely enough, I felt ashamed; because I had chosen to hold a sign that read: "9/11: An Inside Job to Lead Us into War". But why did I feel [shame](#) for this? It's the [truth](#). I think that what I was feeling was embarrassment, because it seemed as though virtually everyone who passed by me (and read the sign) was (probably) thinking I was a kook. And that's embarrassing. Or perhaps it was because I was ashamed at having to be there, at the Pentagon, to begin with . . . that I need to protest my own government, because of its crimes . . . like I was ashamed to be an American.

But I think, too, that my feeling had something to do with being at the [Pentagon](#) itself, because virtually everyone who passed by me (us) seemed to be against me (us). Perhaps there was some element of fear as well? But I'm not afraid of the authorities or of going to jail for a sociopolitical cause, which I've done before; although our government does do its best to keep us [living in fear](#). It just seemed so surreal; sort of like protesting the [Dark Side](#)'s unholy ambitions on [Darth Vader](#)'s [Death Star](#).

Not too unlike protesting in front of an [abortion](#) clinic though . . .

When it comes to [9/11](#), I'm not the one who needs to be ashamed. I didn't kill anyone on 9/11, but [someone](#) did. Some group (conspiracy) of people did. And I don't think it was a group of Islamic fundamentalists that brought down WTC buildings [1](#), [2](#), and [7](#) . . . I think it was elements of our own ([federal](#)) government (i.e., the [military-intelligence](#) complex).

But does this make me a [kook](#)?

The feeling of shame, or embarrassment, is a uniquely human emotion. Dr. Leon Kass, in his book [Toward a More Natural Science](#), points out the fact

that animals do not feel shame; shame is a uniquely human emotion. In short, we are *not* animals.

The [true criminals](#) behind the [terror attacks](#) of 9/11 have yet to be brought to [justice](#). Instead, they continue supporting the [doctrine](#) of endless wars, torture, and unlawful detentions they began nine years ago. Who is running America? The [military-intelligence complex](#)?

It's hardly embarrassing for one to believe that the terror attacks of 9/11 were perpetrated by [rogue](#) elements within our own government, or that the WTC buildings (1, 2, and 7) were brought down in some manner that didn't simply cause their collapse but caused them to [disintegrate](#). Many intelligent people believe the government is covering up the truth about 9/11, and I don't think they should feel any shame for believing this. (See Peter Lance's (.pdf) [9/11 Timeline](#) 1981-2006) I think it's more shameful for one to accept, at face value, [the official government explanation](#) of 9/11, because such acceptance reveals how little thought one has chosen to invest in this [most important](#) of subjects.

America needs citizens who are willing to think.

Please, examine [the evidence](#) for yourself . . . as so many intelligent people are doing. . .

[Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth](#)

[Scholars for 9/11 Truth](#)

[Pilots for 9/11 Truth](#)

[Firefighters for 9/11 Truth](#)

[Medical Professionals for 9/11 Truth](#)

[9/11 Truth](#)

Postmodern Economics

As a libertarian, I realize that money, in order to have any real value, needs to have intrinsic worth—like gold or silver. As a medium of exchange (i.e., money), gold and silver have intrinsic worth, because we can use it for purposes other than as a medium of exchange. For example, we can make jewelry out of it, which adds artistic value to the intrinsic value of the metal itself. Sound money provides a sound basis for an economy. But the US economy is not sound, because it's been off the gold standard for many years. The question we need to ask is: "Why has the US economy gone off the gold standard?" Other important questions we need to answer are: "Was it reasonable for the US to go off the gold standard?" "Is it reasonable for the US to return to the gold standard?" and if it's not reasonable, "What, then, are we to do?"

During the Civil War, the federal government issued \$450 million dollars worth of paper money that was not backed by (i.e., redeemable for) gold. Economically speaking, this was a very unsound policy, because paper money lacks the intrinsic worth of gold, but the federal government needed a way to finance its (Union) army without exhausting its gold reserves.

The 1890's saw the rise of the Populist movement, consisting mostly of farmers and others who were in debt, mostly of the working class. The movement sought a way to free themselves from their economic servitude to the wealthy class, those who had lent them money: the big Wall Street bankers. The Populist wanted cheap (non gold-backed) money—paper (greenbacks) and free (or much cheaper than gold) silver—in order for them to be able to pay back their debts more easily.

Wall Street balked at this because, being in the money business, the bankers knew that the issuance of such cheap money would allow their debtors to pay

back their loans with money that was worth much less than the money they had been lent by the banks.

The same situation is occurring today. The Federal Reserve treats paper money (fiat currency) as if it were backed by gold, even though it's not, meaning that the Fed keeps a tight rein on the money supply in order to benefit Wall Street bankers and investors. If a movement similar to the Populist's rose up today—debtors seeking an easier way to repay their creditors with money that was worth less than the money they had borrowed—we would see this movement clamoring for the Fed to monetize the debt (i.e., create money) and print more paper money. This would infuriate Wall Street, just as the Populist's demand for greenbacks and free silver did, because the Wall Street bankers and investors would lose money while their debtors gained it.

In my opinion, one important reason for the Populist clamor for greenbacks and free silver was the increase in US population and the westward expansion thereof. In short, the gold standard economy only works well when a nation has: 1) a large reserve of gold, and 2) a low-to-moderate sized population. Gold is valuable because it is scarce, and the Federal Reserve, acting as though paper money were gold, attempts to keep paper money scarce in order to maintain its value as a medium of exchange. Monetizing the debt and printing more money leads to inflation, which is a lowering of the money's value, and the Fed and its Wall Street partners try to avoid this situation at all costs. Doing so would deprive Wall Street and its investors of the value of the money it has lent, but it would allow those who find themselves in debt to repay their debts more easily by repaying those debts with inflated currency, meaning the money they repay their loans with is worth much less than the money which they had actually borrowed.

Wall Street would hate this, but people who are in debt would love it.

Population is, I think, an important but often neglected—factor in economics. Consider the gold standard. There is, after all, a very limited supply of gold; it is scarce (a total (mined) of \$4.5 trillion), hence its worth (besides its intrinsic value). The Fed, acting as though its tight control of the money supply duplicates the scarcity of gold, has not allowed the money supply to keep up with the dramatic increase in US population; thereby benefitting Wall Street and its investors but not the working-class (many of whom are out of work thanks the Fed, Wall Street, the Washington politicians, and their corporate friends, who have conspired together to outsource their jobs).

In 1787, when the US adopted the Constitution and was on the gold standard, the US population was somewhere around 3 million persons. By the 1890's, when the Populists began clamoring for the government to free-up the money supply via free silver and greenbacks, the population had risen to around 70 million persons. Today, the US population is over 300 million persons. Due to this dramatic rise in population, I don't think it's reasonable to assume that the US could ever return to the gold standard, nor do I think it's reasonable for the Fed to act as though it's still on the gold standard by keeping a tight rein on the money supply, which only benefits Wall Street lenders and its investors at the expense of the borrowers.

It would seem that postmodern (Keynesian) economics, which is the economic theory behind the modern government practice of creating fiat currency, borrowing on credit, and engaging in deficit spending, is unable to keep up with the times. It's beginning to look a lot like the old gold standard did by in the 1890's: there's just not enough money to go around.

In my opinion, the US government should make the Fed loosen the money supply, implement strong tariff protections for our nation's economy (in order to rid our nation of the flood of cheap goods from overseas (China), begin encouraging US corporations to rebuild

their presence here in the US and start hiring US workers again, and put a freeze on immigration. This would at least be a good start, but I doubt that we will see anything like this. Most likely, the Fed will keep a tight hold on the money supply, deflating the currency as well as the value of what few assets the American people have (like homes), and encourage the Washington government to raise taxes and cut benefits; therefore we can expect to see more jobs lost and more businesses go under, with unemployment figures rising ever higher.

But the Wall Street bankers, their investors, the big corporate executives, and the Washington politicians will be happy, because they aren't feeling the impact of the economic crunch, like so many of the common people are. We're feeling the crunch.

On Political Violence in America

In light of the recent political violence, which has been occasioned by passage of the Democrat's health care reform bill, I would like to repeat here something that I said back in October 2009:

"Have things gotten so bad in the U. S. that our collective political frustrations could actually lead some people to commit acts of political violence? Could some people's words actually incite some people to commit acts of political violence? These are questions many Americans seem to be asking themselves these days. The U.S. has a very long [history](#) of civil unrest and political violence, so it should come as no surprise to us, especially during politically frustrating times, that politically violent acts (of various types) will likely be committed by some people. Well-chosen words can incite powerful emotions, and well-chosen words concerning genuine political issues and the frustrations which accompany them, can certainly incite some people to act violently. To think that words can have no effect upon people whatsoever—either toward their pursuing good actions or for ill—is simply ridiculous. Words are very powerful; 'more powerful', it is said, 'than the sword'." (See my *Political Musings*, of October 2009.)

I hope that you followed the link, which I provided above, concerning America's long history of political violence. It's a very long list of political violence. Over the past few days, I've heard people (e.g., politicians, talking heads) saying that political violence is "not the American way" of doing things. On the contrary, until recently, political violence WAS the American way of doing things.

These same people are also complaining, again, about the conservative radio, television, and internet talk show hosts whose inflammatory rhetoric (i.e., words) can/does/will incite their listeners to commit acts

of political violence. What they want, of course, is for these conservative talk show hosts to shut their mouths and for people to behave, and start acting like the good little children that we're supposed to be.

I've long said the next book I write will be about politics: American Politics. And the most important thing anyone really needs to know about American politics, which allows us to see through to the bottom of virtually every political issue, is that governments only have two schools of thought concerning how a government should govern its peoples: treat them as children who are dependent upon you, or treat them as adults who not dependent upon you.

America has always been a very conservative nation politically. It's that sense of liberty, independence, and freedom America has always held forth as its ideal which has drawn so many people to it. America, by nature is very individualistic, libertarian, and conservative. People basically want the right to be left alone by their government. This is why liberal politics has never been able to gain much ground here in the U. S. (as it has in Europe).

As I said, my next book is going to be about politics, so, while doing research for this book, I'm reading an old textbook on political theory: *A History of Political Theory, Third Edition*, by George H. Sabine (Holt, Rinehart, Winston, Inc., 1937, 1950, 1961), and the author, in discussing the different philosophical schools of thought concerning rulers and their subjects found in Plato's *Statesman* and in Aristotle's *Politics*, says that:

"The question, of course, is whether subjects shall be assumed to be dependent upon rulers, as children must be dependent upon their parents, or whether they shall be assumed to be responsible and self-governing" (pp. 72-73).

In America, it should be obvious to us which of our political parties assumes we are children and which does not. The liberal Democrats assume the people are like dependent children, and the conservative Republicans assume the people are responsible and self-governing. Not much has changed in the past 2,000 years.

That having been said, neither political party today is working for the people. Both parties are criminal; both parties are corrupt; and this government is broken beyond all normal means of repair: the next-or any future-election will solve nothing; more elections-as-usual will simply perpetuate the broken and corrupt *status quo*.

It's time to get serious folks. Let's stop acting like the good little children that the politicians in Washington want us to be. We've put up with their bullshit for long enough now, let's take our nation back: NOW!

How I Became a Liberal Communist Tree-Hugger

Actually, I haven't "become" anything but I've been called all of the above. I suppose that what those words actually *mean* is a matter of interpretation . . . isn't it? Perhaps the best way to analyze these words is to consider them as utterances, in the Bakhtinian sense, as words or phrases, written or spoken, that have originated within a particular social context. In this case, a sociopolitical context, or, as Bakhtin would call it: a sociopolitical speech genre. These are powerful, socially and politically created words (and situations!) that we've inherited from those who've preceded us; words that are intended to be persuasive. (Political speech, especially when it's a combination of words and images, is always propagandistic.)

Sociopolitical speech is almost, by definition, polarized. There are two sides to every debate and every story . . . polar extremes are to be expected. Even violent ones.

War is violent, by definition.

The warmongering and the fear-mongering continue, unabated, in America . . . the Muslim fanatics are (supposedly) out to get us, you know.

I was accused of having been brainwashed recently, which is odd . . . considering that I haven't watched television news in many years. If I were to sit in front of the television set every night and watch, oh, say, Fox News perhaps, then one might say, accurately, that I may be allowing myself to become influenced by the media, or brainwashed, by Fox News. But considering that I never watch television, how can one say I'm being brainwashed? I do watch Alex Jones occasionally, but Alex has been around for years . . . and so have I.

I'm quite capable of discerning truth from error concerning Alex Jones. I would say that Jones is 98% correct, and it's encouraging just to know that he's out there . . . even if his broadcast is only three hours a day, five days a week, and two hours on Sunday. Compared to Fox News' 24/7/365 influence, Jones is a piker when it comes to being able to influence anyone; let alone brainwash someone. Brainwashing would require that someone have 24/7/365 access to every home in America . . . sort of like Fox News has . . .

Hmmm . . .

I'm hardly a Liberal; and as anyone who has ever taken the time to read my writings knows I'm a Libertarian with Christian moral convictions. And there's a BIG difference.

I'm also a Constitutionalist, with a strict interpretation; meaning that I believe the US federal government should be restricted to doing only that which is specifically outlined for it to do in the US Constitution, which is, after all, the whole point of the US Constitution to begin with; including, especially, the US Congress alone having the authority to wage war.

Hmmm . . .

And I'M brainwashed?

I'm no fan of the federal government, I can assure you. And I think a Liberal is, by definition, a fan of the feds. I am not a fan of the feds at all.

I've had my run-ins with the feds over the years, and I don't think they're a big fan of me either. I can't imagine they think of me as a Liberal. Heck, if you count my last run-in with the feds in DC, I've been arrested and locked up by them a grand total of six times now: three times by the US military, twice by the FBI, and once by the US Park Police.

Crazy . . . can you imagine, too, how many times I've been stopped and asked by the police to show my ID, so they could run me for warrants . . . I've lost count . . .

And I'm not a bad guy either, that's the thing. I just have that bad guy mystique . . .

Anyways, a Constitutionalist Christian Libertarian like me is far from being a Liberal or a Communist . . . and although I do love trees, I'm not a tree hugger. I used to work for [a very large paper company](#) and we had a saying: paper is a renewable resource. But I am against cutting old growth trees I think it's criminal for someone to do that.

When it comes to economics, I'm more a fan of [Adam Smith](#) than I am of [Karl Marx](#), so I certainly can't be a Communist. I'm for Ending the Fed too, which is not exactly the political stance on the Federal Reserve that a good commie would take. Is it?

But I suppose that, since I am against the [war\(s\)](#), the [Global War on Terror](#), the rise of the US [police state](#), the failed [War on Drugs](#), and suspect that rogue elements of our own government (and [others](#)) were behind the terror attacks of [9/11](#), this DOES make me a Liberal Communist, in the [Glennbeckian](#) sense of these terms.

On the other hand, there are good reasons for Beck and others considering me to be a Liberal and a Communist. I believe that being a Christian is a [communal](#) activity, not a [personal](#) affair. So yes, I believe in [social justice](#), relieving the plight of the poor, having compassion on those who are less fortunate, working to build [a more just society](#) for all people, including those [not-yet-born](#). I recently spent a week at the [DC Catholic Worker House](#) and God knows the [Catholic Workers](#) are considered Communist, even through the founder of the Catholic Worker Movement, [Dorothy Day](#), had [the same sociopolitical ideology](#) that I have: social justice is the work of God's people, [the Church](#), and not of the government.

All of which makes me an odd bird, politically speaking, I know. I mean, just what political category do I fit into anyway? The Liberals are mostly pro-aborts and the Conservatives are mostly war-hawks (some of them chicken-hawks), so where does that leave me? I'm pro-life and I'm anti-war; two issues which need to become related in the minds of many people. I mean, have a heart people!

As I've said before, I don't know about you, but I've seen carnage—meaning: the bodies of human beings that have been torn into chunks of flesh, or meat, and it's always broken my heart to see this. Not right away, of course, but afterward. A person that someone loved torn into to bloody pieces of meat. Killing someone requires justification; like self-defense. Preemptive killing is murder, and is considered such by the states and the federal government except, it seems, when it comes to our military adventures (in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan) and abortion. For us Americans, it's okay for us to tear people to shreds anytime we feel the need to do so, isn't it?

I mean, what is justice? And who really cares about *that* anyway . . . ?

Do you?

Foucault and the Folly of the Narcissistic Self

We're now studying the French philosopher [Michel Foucault](#) in our Literary and Cultural theory class and I'm finding it difficult, if not impossible, to read his book: [Introduction the History of Sexuality](#). In fact, I'm not reading it; because it's crap.

When it comes to philosophy and being a philosopher, Foucault is a [tawdry](#) imitation of the real thing. He has nothing to tell me. The word *philosophy* means: *the love of wisdom* (Greek: *philos*, meaning: love; and *sophia*, meaning: wisdom) and there is no wisdom to be found in Foucault's writings. His writings are certainly pretentious, verbose, and academic, so that he might appear to have been a philosopher, but I can assure you that he wasn't.

Although I am not a professional philosopher, I can honestly say that there is more wisdom in my one [book](#) than in all of Foucault's [books](#) put together. And for one, simple reason: I believe that love and compassion for others is the only real purpose in life, whereas Foucault believes that the only real purpose in life is the domination and exploitation of others for one's own purposes and pleasures.

There's no love of wisdom to be found in his writings; quite the opposite. Philosophy is an art, and the philosopher is an artist who seeks [goodness, beauty, and truth](#). Like someone who urinates on stage or affixes a urinal to a museum wall and calls it art, Foucault's impure "philosophy" can be likened to excrement. And one does not consider excrement art. If anything, his is an anti-philosophy, or a love of foolishness.

As the late Professor of Literature at Boston University Roger Shattuck has pointed out, in his book [Forbidden Knowledge: From Prometheus to Pornography](#), Foucault embraced the moral nihilism of

the Marquis de Sade; from whom we get the terms: sadistic and sadism.

What, then, is Foucault's great and lasting philosophical accomplishment? To tell us that abusing others physically and sexually—and then killing them—is to live the authentic philosophical life.

Shattuck tells us that "Michel Foucault presents as fundamental for the emergence of the modern era out of seventeenth century classicism the fact that Sade revealed to us the truth about man's relation to nature. Foucault plants his declarations at crucial junctures in his two major works of 1961 and 1966. These four passages reveal the usually obscured center of his ethos:

'Sadism . . . is a massive cultural fact that appeared precisely at the end of the eighteenth century and that constitutes one of the greatest conversions of the occidental imagination . . . madness of desire, the insane delight of love and death in the limitless presumptions of appetite.' (Madness and Civilization, 210)

'Through Sade and Goya, the Western world received the possibility of transcending its reason in violence . . . ' (Madness and Civilization, 285)

'After Sade, violence, life and death, desire, and sexuality will extend, below the level of representation, an immense expanse of darkness, which we are now attempting to recover . . . in our discourse, in our freedom, in our thought.' (The Order of Things, 211)

'Among the mutations that have affected the knowledge of things . . . only one, which began a century and a half ago . . . has allowed the figure of man to appear.' (The Order of Things, 386)

The last quotation from the final page of *The Order of Things* does not allude to Sade by name. But, in association with the other passages and in context, there can be little doubt that the great cultural

'mutation' welcomed by Foucault refers directly to Sade's moral philosophy and to its practice in actual life." (*Forbidden Knowledge*, 246-247)

Why the admiration of Sade's morally nihilistic-sadistic-philosophy? Foucault's thinking, here, is hardly original. Philosophically, he borrowed the moral nihilism of a previous philosopher, [Frederick Nietzsche](#), who at least had the intellectual honesty to lay bare his hatred for God and morality in plain language; unlike Foucault, whose philosophical jargon, rhetorical flourishes, and pretentious historical investigations knowingly obscured—rather than revealed—the truth of what he believed. Foucault, in fact, is the exact opposite of what a philosopher is supposed to be. Nietzsche—as wrong as his morally nihilistic philosophy is—at least had the decency to be honest and plain spoken about what it was that he believed.

This moral nihilism, however, was not original to Nietzsche's thought; Nietzsche simply borrowed and re-packaged (as Foucault did with Nietzsche) the morally nihilistic philosophy of certain previous philosophers: the ancient philosophers of India, whose morally nihilistic philosophy can be found in the [Rig Veda](#), the [Upanishads](#), and the [Bhagavad Gita](#), which tells us that people who are enlightened are able (and entitled) to transcend (i.e., go [beyond](#)) the unenlightened (and therefore illusory) categories of "good" and "evil" (Nietzsche's concept of [cyclical time](#) was also taken from ancient Hindu philosophy).

I had read and understood many of these ancient Hindu writings by the time I was eighteen years old and I also considered myself (at that time) to have been enlightened by doing so. And I'll tell you why. As an example, let's examine the message of the Bhagavad Gita, which is the most sacred of written works to those of the Hindu religion, because it presents an excellent, word-picture example of the enlightened, morally nihilistic Hindu philosophy about which I am speaking.

The Bhagavad Gita is a story, and in this story the main character, Arunja, faces-what appears, to him, to be-a moral dilemma: he faces, in battle, some of his own relatives and he is hesitant to kill them. [Krishna](#), who is an incarnation of [Vishnu](#), tells Arunja that he simply doesn't understand the true nature of things. Arunja's dilemma does not really exist, because people do not actually die; they only appear-to the unenlightened-to die. People, like everything else, are [Brahman](#)-a sort of monistic Life-Force-that cannot die, and everything that appears to dies actually goes on living forever, only to return again and again ([reincarnation](#)). Death, like the world itself, is merely an illusion ([maya](#)):

"That which is can never cease to be; that which is not will not exist. To see this truth of both is theirs who part essence from accident, substance from shadow. Indestructible, learn thou! The Life is, spreading life through all; it cannot anywhere, by any means, be anywise diminished, stayed, or changed. But for these fleeting frames which it informs with spirit deathless, endless, infinite, they perish. Let them perish, Prince! and fight! He who shall say, 'Lo! I have slain a man!' He who shall think, 'Lo! I am slain!' those both know naught! Life cannot slay. Life is not slain!" (Bhagavad Gita, [Chapter Two](#))

The act of killing someone, whether in battle or anywhere else, is simply an illusion, which the unenlightened are deceived by. This is Nietzsche's concept of going beyond good and evil. The enlightened are not bound to illusory "realities", such as the moral categories of "good" and "evil", because they know the truth: all is one and one is all (what we call [monism](#) or [pantheism](#)).

I once explained this concept, in an occult bookstore, to a young lady who had told me that she had rejected the God of Christianity because she had been raped, because she didn't believe that a good and loving God would have allowed such a thing to happen to her. And she had now adopted the Life-Force "god" of pantheism and reincarnation in its stead. I told her that, in Christianity, God holds the man who

raped her responsible for his evil act, whereas in pantheism "god" is everything and everything is "god" and her thinking that "she" had been "raped" by this "man" was an illusion of the unenlightened. At best, we could probably say only that "god" had "raped" "god". This, I told her, was why I was no longer a pantheist, because the Christian concept of God allows for justice, for the man to be punished for what he did—eternally, if he does not truly repent—whereas the pantheistic concept of "god" does not, because all is one and one is all—the incarnate appearances of people and things just keep recycling around and around eternally.

She wasn't too crazy about pantheism after hearing it laid bare in such a way.

This is why I don't like Foucault, and his fascination the Marquis de Sade: he thinks that he and the Marquis are enlightened to the point where they can do whatever they damn well please, and what they wish to do is to do exactly the opposite of what Christ himself told us to do, which is to "do unto others as you would have them to do unto you". Foucault, like Nietzsche before him, believes that religion and society, influenced by Christian morality, have hindered men from living truly authentic philosophical lives; he believes that he (we) must throw off all of the weak-minded and weak-willed hindrances of unenlightened religious and societal oppression (i.e., Christian morality) and do, like Sade, the exact opposite of what society and religion demands of us: "do unto others that which you would never wish to have done to yourselves" (e.g., incest, torture, rape, murder, necrophilia).

All Michel Foucault has done, philosophically, is to stand the Golden Rule upon its head; he's simply taken the three philosophical ideals of Goodness, Beauty, and Truth and turned them the other way around, making his philosophy the pursuit of Evil, Ugliness, and Lies. It doesn't take great mind to give us this sort of "wisdom"; what it takes the waste of a great mind and a mind (like Foucault's) is a terrible thing to waste. Sadly, Foucault's great

accomplishment in life was to have wasted his mind and, in the end, to have laid waste to his body as well. In short, his was a *wasted life*.

Is it any wonder that people, today, seem to have very little, if any, sympathy for those innocents around the world who are suffering, and who have been, for years, suffering at the hands of U. S. troops in Iraq and Afghanistan? But since the U. S. wishes to attack, kill, and torture the peoples of these nations we at least have the pseudo-philosophical "will to power" notions of Nietzsche and Foucault to endorse—even praise—such behavior. Perhaps both the U. S. and Nazi Germany are not only to be excused but praised for their sadomasochistic tortures of the many prisoners they've held captive in their many prisons and concentration camps. And if the Marquis de Sade is to become our guiding literary and philosophical light of truth, then we must also praise, rather than scorn and imprison, the individual man who wishes to sexually torture, rape, and murder his innocent young daughter as well.

Foucault scorned biblical notions of morality, believing that they hindered his ability to realize and actualize his identity, which he accomplished at bath houses in San Francisco, contracting AIDS in the process, but what he failed to realize is that the Bible had already identified him and his kind (i.e., pseudo-intellectuals who hate God) long ago: "Claiming to be wise, they became fools . . . therefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, to the dishonoring of their bodies among themselves, because they exchanged the truth about God for a lie . . . " (Romans 1:22-25).

If Kierkegaard's existentialism opened the door to deciding for ourselves what is right and what is wrong, then Nietzsche and Foucault walked right through it: the enlightened individual's will to power over others is beyond the judgments that can be passed upon the enlightened individual by an unenlightened society.

It should be no surprise to us that, when we choose to reject the natural, innate, God-given standard of morality found in the human heart and the human conscience, we will inevitably begin--callously and cold-heartedly-- abusing others and even ourselves in the unending, unsatisfying, and misguided pursuit of narcissistic pleasure. This is the legacy of Michel Foucault: the self, unhinged from its natural, innate, and God-given moral obligation (i.e., to be concerned for the well-being of the other peoples with whom we share our world) now lives in pursuit of folly, running amok in a morally bankrupt and murderously orgiastic plethora of narcissistic delights as it exerts raw power over others in order to dominate, use, and abuse them for its own selfish, corrupt, and depraved pleasures.

(Thanks Michel. As if the world weren't already a bad enough place to be when you were here, you've now helped to make it an even worse place. A mind, especially a mind as great as yours, truly is a terrible thing to waste and I'm truly sorry that you somehow managed to waste the great mind that God had given you.

Love Implementing the Demands of Justice

Two theories exist that we, as a society, can choose to become the legal and philosophical basis for our society: [natural law](#) or [the will to power](#).

These are the only two choices that exist for us.

I've intentionally [set forth](#) the natural law basis of the [Declaration of Independence](#) and the civil rights movement of the [Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.](#) as exemplars of America's natural law foundation. And I've done so for two reasons: 1) because most people are simply unaware of the natural law basis of both the Declaration of Independence and Dr. King's civil rights movement; and 2) because anyone who chooses to reject either the Declaration of Independence or Dr. King's civil rights movement is simply committing social, political, and intellectual suicide (think [Rand Paul](#) here).

The ancient philosopher [Socrates](#) was unpopular with many people for one reason: he took people's philosophical positions to their logical (and often [absurd](#)) conclusions, which most people simply didn't enjoy facing. In his dialogue with [Gorgias](#) (recounted for us by [Plato](#)), Socrates took Gorgias' theory of justice to its logical and absurd conclusion: that *might makes right*. Against Gorgias, Socrates believed that justice transcended humankind, because it was eternal and divine.

In short, these two ancient understandings of justice are the same two theories of justice that we, today, have to build our society upon: *natural law* (i.e., justice is eternal and divine) and *the will to power* (i.e., might makes right).

As I've pointed out [elsewhere](#) America was founded upon natural law because it was thought to be the surest foundation upon which to build a society.

Might makes right and the will to power might be interesting (Sophistic) philosophical positions to debate, but these understandings of justice—as something that is personally interpreted and power-based—simply do not work in a society that is attempting to build a just and harmonious society. In fact, they are contrary to it.

I've also pointed out (elsewhere) the logical and absurd conclusions of the will to power as demonstrated by the tawdry "philosophy" of Michel Foucault, based as it was upon Frederick Nietzsche's "enlightened" concept of the transcendence of such "weak-minded" categories as "good" and "evil" and its concomitant *will to power* "ethic".

The will to power theory of "justice" leads, inexorably, to the domination of the weak by the strong, the oppression of the weak by the strong, and the Sadistic sexual torture of the weak by the strong (simply for the evil enjoyment of the strong).

Sound like anyone (or any nation) you know?

Concerning the dramatic contrast between the ethical theories of Dr. King and Frederick Nietzsche, the late Boston University professor Roger Shattuck has said,

"A succinct and unflinching answer to Nietzsche arose out of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s resolve to protect the civil rights struggle from the forces of radical black violence. In 'Where Do We Go from Here?'—his 1967 Presidential address to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference—King picks out as one of the great errors in history the interpretation of power and love as polar opposites and the association of power with violence. King cut to the core of the matter with a no-nonsense simplification:

'It was this misinterpretation that caused Nietzsche, who was a philosopher of the will to power, to reject the Christian concept of love. It was this same misinterpretation which induced Christian theologians to reject Nietzschean

philosophy of the will to power in the name of the Christian idea of love. Now, we've got to get this thing right. What is needed is a realization that power without love is reckless and abusive, and love without power is sentimental and anemic. Power at its best is love implementing the demands of justice.' ([A Testament of Hope](#), p. 247)

King was not just playing games with the words *love* and *power*. He was reaching back to a series of his own earlier readings (above all, in [Paul Tillich](#)) and writings and to his experience as intellectual and tactical leader of the civil rights movement. 'To get this thing right' meant to King an appeal to a long-mediated and carefully defined philosophic position: the philosophy of non-violence These two prophets, Nietzsche and King, confront us with a continuing struggle between power and justice that no thinking person can responsibly turn away from" (Roger Shattuck, [Forbidden Knowledge: From Prometheus to Pornography](#); p. 303).

No thinking American citizen can responsibly turn away from our civic and moral obligation—our *duty*—to put our nation upon a proper course of justice.

Considering the current situation, in which anyone who dissents, politically, against the militaristic power-state that America has now become, since 9/11, there is little hope that any non-violent revolution of love—by means of protests involving both active and passive [resistance](#)—would be successful. Most Americans seem not to care, or worse: seem to actually support the militaristic power-state that America has now become. Protesters are easily discouraged by the government's ability to declare arbitrary [free speech zones](#) as well as its ability to [fine and imprison dissenters](#), virtually at will. The individual protester must decide whether it's worth losing everything simply to take a stand for love and for what's right.

Mexico's Cult(ure) of Death

Mexico has a long and bloody history, as well as a murderous and bloody present.

The ancient [Aztecs](#) once offered bloody human sacrifices to the war god Huitzilopochtli; the [Spanish conquistadors](#) once slaughtered thousands of Aztecs; [Mexicans](#) once fought a bloody war to gain independence from Spain; Mexicans once fought a bloody [revolution](#) to gain a constitutional republic; and the Mexican drug cartels are now [wreaking bloody havoc](#) upon the Mexican people and authorities, plunging [some cities](#) into a [murderous anarchy](#), thanks to the ([failed](#)) "War on Drugs".

It's no wonder that many Mexican people have now developed a devotion to the new (and unofficial) patron saint of the murderous narco-traffickers: [Santa Muerte](#) (Saint Death).

Another phenomenon of Mexican narco-culture has been the rise of a new music genre: [narcocorridos](#), or *drug ballads*. Mexico's narco-culture of murder and violence has also given birth to a new genre of film: [narco cinema](#).

In short, the murderous Mexican drug cartels have virtually taken over Mexico; even to the point of influencing the Mexican culture's religion, music, and film.

[Cuidad Juarez](#), especially, has become a [murderous](#) free-for-all.

A large Mexican city, which borders the US, [Juarez](#) is just across the Rio Grande from its sister city: El Paso, Texas. From the air, the two cities are [indistinguishable](#) and appear to be one, large city (with a combined population of 2.4 million people).

I realize that, to most people, Juarez, Mexico is a very far-off place; but it's really not—it's right on the US - Mexico border.

Being a border city, Juarez has always been a violent place because of all the thugs who tend to congregate in border cities. But recently, due to the narco-traffickers, the violence has gotten out of control.

I used to live in El Paso, and I've been to Juarez; most recently back in 2002. Even then, Juarez was known as the city of disappearing women, so it probably wasn't the best idea for me and my girlfriend (at the time) to visit Juarez, but we did . . . and we also had a wonderful time there. My girlfriend, with her long blond hair, stood out like a sore thumb. Thankfully no one snatched her off the street—pushing her into a car, never to be seen or heard from again—as so often happens to many of the women (and men) who live in Juarez. Today Juarez is so violent and out of control that the people who live there are living in a constant state of fear.

Human life is very cheap in Mexico these days, thanks to the narco-traffickers.

I believe human life is precious, and it breaks my heart to know that the people of Mexico are suffering under the murderous oppression of the violent drug cartels. I think we need to help the Mexican people take control of their country in order to gain their own safety and security. There's no excuse for us allowing what continues to go on there, and things are only getting worse.

Let's help the Mexican people build the culture of life they deserve.

The drug-related violence in Mexico is directly related to the US market demand for illegal drugs, and the best—and only—way to end the murderous violence in Mexico is for the US to decriminalize these drugs. One drug in particular, marijuana, which is simply a plant, should be completely legalized. Because the Mexican Drug Trafficking Organizations (DTOs) use the money they make smuggling marijuana into the US to fund their narcotics trafficking, weapons purchases, and bribery money, the elimination

of the venture capital cash flow from their marijuana sales would effectively put them out of business. Cut-off the DTO's venture capital by legalizing marijuana and these violent businesses will fold up.

According to [FBI testimony](#) before the US Congress, May 5, 2010:

"Mexico is the number one foreign supplier of marijuana abused in the United States. In fact, according to a 2008 inter-agency report, marijuana is the top revenue generator for Mexican DTOs—a cash crop that finances corruption and the carnage of violence year after year. The profits derived from marijuana trafficking—an industry with minimal overhead costs, controlled entirely by the traffickers—are used not only to finance other drug enterprises by Mexico's poly-drug cartels, but also to pay recurring "business" expenses, purchase weapons, and bribe corrupt officials."

The US needs to co-opt this cash crop. Take this money out of the hands of the Mexican DTOs and put it into the hands of the American tax-payers. The US economy could really use that money right now and the Mexican people could really benefit from the defunding of the murderous Mexican drug cartels, which have made their lives a living hell.

If you disagree with me, if you don't believe that marijuana should be legalized, then I'm sorry, but you're not *thinking* about this issue you're just *reacting* to it. Marijuana use is nowhere near as bad for people, health-wise, as is the use of alcohol. Yet alcohol is legal. Nor does marijuana use impair people to the extent that alcohol use does. Yet alcohol is legal. But alcohol *used to be* illegal in the US, during prohibition.

Despite its prohibition, alcohol continued to manufactured and delivered by organized crime syndicates and it continued to be consumed by the American people. The [organized crime syndicates](#) that manufactured and distributed alcohol made huge profits from their illegal trade, controlled their

trade through violence and murder, and used their profits to fund other illegal ventures and to corrupt police and elected officials. In short, the same thing is happening with marijuana prohibition today that once happened with alcohol prohibition. So it doesn't take an Einstein to figure this one out: [legalize marijuana](#).

The good people of Juarez, who are suffering, are [begging](#) us to.

The Wrong ANSWER to the Arizona Question

From an email, which I received from [ANSWER](#), regarding its (recent) protest of Arizona Governor Jan Brewer at the National Governor's Association Meeting in Boston, today:

"At the rally opening, Jennifer Zaldana, representing the ANSWER Coalition, said 'Today, our message will be heard: Legal Rights for Immigrant Workers! And this is not only a message to Arizona Gov. Jan Brewer, but to all of the state governors. We will not let the racist Arizona law SB 1070—or any racist bills being considered across the country—go unchallenged.'"

Okay, well, I've [written on this subject](#) before . . . and I suppose I'll have to keep writing about it, because so many people are just plain getting it wrong.

Please consider what Jennifer Zaldana, representing the ANSWER Coalition, said: "Legal Rights for Immigrant Workers!"

Okay . . . who, I ask, has a problem with *that*? *That* being *what she said*.

America is a nation made up of immigrants. *We're all immigrants*. So who, in their right mind, would oppose *immigrants*?

Perhaps it's the *workers* aspect of what she said that some people oppose? No, we know it's not *that*.

We know what she means, and what she supports, yet what she also refused, honestly, to say: "Legal Rights for *Illegal* Immigrant Workers!"

But *this* doesn't sound quite right, does it? It doesn't quite ring true.

Anyone who knows me knows that I love Mexico, the Mexican people, and their culture; that I've been to Mexico many times; and that my heart is broken over [the violence in Mexico](#), which is caused by America's failed war on drugs. Heck, I even have a large image of [La Virgen de Guadalupe](#) on the back of my pick-up truck's rear window!

But I am *not* in favor of open borders. Immigrants ought to immigrate legally, not illegally, and I cannot support illegal immigration . . . from anywhere, not just Mexico and Central America.

I am not a racist. And for anyone to say that I am a racist, simply because I believe that people ought to immigrate to this—or any other—country legally, would be wrong . . . or worse: *it would be a lie*.

Please people: get over yourselves.

Consider this: a nation is like a home. And who among you would allow anyone and everyone who wished to do so to enter and live in your home?

Right: none of you.

For those of you who are unaware, the drug related [violence](#) in Mexico has led to [anarchy](#); meaning a total breakdown in law and order. For example, a person who is angry with someone and wishes to kill her—for any reason—can now do so, with impunity, in Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico. Why? Because the victim is just another [one of the many bodies](#) dumped in Juarez everyday; and the police cannot—and will not, for fear of their lives—investigate the many murders that occur there.

In Mexico, the authorities are murdered, routinely, by paramilitary groups, especially [Los Zetas](#), and this murderous intimidation of authority has now spread to, you guessed it: [Arizona](#).

This, my friends, I can assure you, is no laughing matter. Neither is this a matter for ANSWER to get bent out of shape (and lie) about in order to further

their overall agenda, most of which, besides this illegal immigration issue, I agree with.

Maybe I should start a group called TRUTH?

Let's be realistic . . . and honest. America is our home, and like any home there is only room (and jobs) enough for a certain amount of people. In short, immigration must always be controlled: no nation can allow open borders.

According to *The Week* magazine (September 18, 2009) the US lost 223,000 jobs during the ten year period extending from 1999-2009 and, during the same time period, the US population *increased by 33.5 million* people.

Yeah . . . do the math on *that*.

Where, pray tell, are these 33.5 million immigrants (legal or illegal) supposed to work? And where are all of the people who were already here to begin with, being natural born and long-time taxpaying citizens, supposed to work?

The US government, for the past twenty years, in the name of free trade and the global economy, has systematically dismantled America's industrial base; thereby dismantling its economy as well. We were told, for eight years, by then president Bill Clinton, that we would have a service economy, which means: no *real* economy whatsoever.

And now, according to some people (ANSWER and many others) we're supposed to have open borders as well?

Yeah, I don't think so.

THINK about this people. Please.

(Maybe I should start a group called THINK, because there's (apparently) not much *thinking* going on these days.)

I *lived* in Arizona, *southern Arizona* . . . *recently*. How many people who protest the new Arizona law have even *been* to Arizona? Let alone know what actually goes on there? As I do; from personal experience.

I support Humane Borders, which is a group that provides warnings and water stations for those illegal immigrants who manage to get past the US-Mexico border and *could die of thirst without these water stations*. But I also support the US Border Patrol *sending them back* to wherever they came from if there're caught here *illegally*.

I myself have thought about immigrating to Mexico, but the cost of doing so legally is prohibitive to me. I've even tried to immigrate there illegally, but was turned back at an inside-the-country customs check-point. Had I bypassed the checkpoint, as I had considered doing, I could have *and should have been* arrested for immigrating *illegally*. Not because the Mexican peoples are racist, although I was obviously stopped at the checkpoint because I was white, but because *I was breaking the Mexican immigration law*.

See my point?

I've spent a lot of time-years-in the US-Mexico border region; and I love it. I have also seen, over the past twenty years, an improvement in US border security. But I can assure you, the US-Mexico border region is a vast ocean of desert which is simply hard to control, due to its vastness.

I've been in the area, in southern Arizona, that is a vast corridor for regular marijuana trafficking. It's simply hard to control, because the area is so vast. And I wrote on this while I was there. I think most people are simply oblivious to the implications of the situation. For example, I was living in El Paso, Texas when the authorities discovered the bodies of eighteen people, illegal aliens all, in nearby Sierra Blanca, Texas, who had been trapped, by their human smugglers (coyotes), in a railroad boxcar in 120 (plus) degree heat. The police found that the

people had, *with their bare hands*, managed to dig, in desperation, through the (very) thick wooden flooring of the boxcar, a (very) small hole through which some of them could get air.

This is, as I said, no laughing matter folks.
Nor is it a matter of racism . . . ANSWER.

THINK about this issue people.

Do I have the right to grope a woman anytime I please? Does a woman not have the right to her private personal space that NO ONE, *without her permission*, is allowed to enter?

Sure she does. Just like you, your home, and your nation has a right to protection of your personal space, which requires your permission for someone to enter it.

"Legal Rights for *Illegal* Immigrant Workers!"?

Nope.

Sorry.

How the Feds Plan to Stop Homegrown Terrorism

The Obama administration is planning to crack down on homegrown terrorism. As I've recently pointed out, terrorism is a tactic not an entity; therefore the only way to "stop" homegrown terrorism is to implement total police state tactics. If the Feds are concerned about car bombs (Times Square) and shooters (Fort Hood), then the only way to end these sorts of threats is to suspect (and search) everyone who might drive a car or have a gun.

The Feds *will* begin implementing more stringent police state tactics to combat this threat, but there are, of course, *more traditional* ways of dealing with homegrown terror threats. As they've done for many years, the FBI will infiltrate terrorist groups and will even encourage and assist radicalized individuals to engage in acts of terrorism.

Consider the first World Trade Center bombing in 1993. The FBI had an informant on the inside of the terrorist cell that was subsequently found responsible for the bombing. But what many people fail to realize is that, while the informant had been led to believe that the FBI would provide inert material for the bomb as a substitute for live material, as part of a supposed sting operation, the FBI itself provided the live bomb material and allowed the bombing to go forward rather than "stinging" the terrorists as the informant had been led to believe.

Likewise, the Feds were also well aware of (and likely assisted in) the homegrown terrorist bombing of the Murrah federal building in Oklahoma City in 1995. In that case, the ATF had its paid informant, Carol Howe, who kept them apprised of the bombers plans.

One of the more bizarre plot twists in the run up to the terror attacks of 9/11 is that two of the alleged hijackers were actually living with a paid FBI informant in San Diego, California; a fact alluded, but not admitted to (in a footnote), within the official government report of the 9/11 commission. What many people fail to realize is that the Fed's plan to *foil* homegrown terrorism is simply a plan to *control* (from the inside) homegrown terrorism.

The Feds do this by infiltrating terrorist groups as well as by encouraging and assisting individuals to engage in acts of terrorism as part of a sting operation. Once the plot goes forward, these individuals—and not the FBI agents—are arrested and the FBI is credited with having foiled a terrorist plot. The FBI was involved in this type of agent provocateurs activity recently in both Springfield, Illinois and Dallas, Texas.

The notion that government agents will provoke civilians to commit acts of terrorism is nothing new and should not surprise us. Anyone familiar with Joseph Conrad's novel The Secret Agent or the Wackowski brother's film V for Vendetta, with its mention of Guy Fawkes and the Gunpowder Treason and Plot, will be familiar with how governments use *agent provocateurs* to set-up civilians to take the fall for terrorist attacks, which the governments themselves have instigated, designed to grant more police, military, and propaganda powers to the governments, which use alleged threats of *dangerous terrorists* living among us, in order to instill a culture of fear within the (trusting and unsuspecting) civilian population. As I've said, the government's use of *agent provocateurs* should come as no surprise to us. Anyone who has ever seen the television show *Cops* will certainly be familiar with how *local* governments, via the local police, will use *agent provocateurs* to set-up civilians to engage in criminal activity so that they might arrest these citizens for engaging in criminal activity, which the police *agent provocateurs* have, themselves, instigated.

For example, local police, in order to crack down on prostitution, will have a female police officer act as a prostitute by convincing unsuspecting men, via solicitation, that they are providing sex for money. When these unsuspecting men hand over the money they are then arrested by waiting, watching, police officers. Likewise, local police officers will act as drug dealers by exchanging drugs for money with unsuspecting citizens. When the unsuspecting citizens hand over the money they are then arrested by waiting, watching, police officers.

One of the problems with a government's use of *agent provocateurs* is that the government's own agents must engage in illegal activities in order to secure an arrest. Not only is it illegal to pay a woman for sex; it's also illegal to sell sex for money, which is exactly what the government's agent does. Not only is it illegal to buy drugs; it's also illegal to sell drugs, which is exactly what the government's agent does. Not only is it illegal to blow up a building; it's also illegal to encourage, and conspire with, others to do so, which is exactly what the government's agent does.

As far as the terrorist threat from al Qaeda goes, five-time Emmy Award winning investigative journalist [Peter Lance](#) has uncovered evidence that the FBI has been aware of—and even assisted in—[every terrorist plot](#) that al Qaeda has ever [pulled off](#); including, especially, 9/11.

The Obama administration, in order to combat the threat of homegrown terrorism will, as I've said, continue to use [police state tactics](#) to avert the supposed terrorist "threat". But the administration will also continue its time honored—yet quite *dishonorable*—tradition of using *agent provocateurs* in order to set-up civilians as participants in government sponsored terror attacks, as it's done (repeatedly) in the past and as it's (most likely and most recently) done with the so-called [Times Square bomber](#).

The Demise of Anglo-American Colonialism

I wish more people had a better understanding of world history. All of the problems we face today have historical beginnings and if one is ignorant of these beginnings one has no way of understanding what's really going on. Consider, for instance, the on-going crisis (wars) in the Middle East and our on-going and problematic relationships with Russia and China.

What we, today, are witnessing is the death of the Anglo-British-American Empire. [Colonialism](#) and imperialism are dead yet Great Britain and America refuse to surrender their colonialist and [imperialist](#) ideology. Rather than admit the error of our ways, repent of the evil we've done and continue to do and start minding our own business, we continue the unwinnable strategy of telling other peoples in other lands (whom we deem inferior) what to do and punishing them for not minding us—their superiors.

When I was in the U. S. Army, a long time ago, the insignia belonging to the first unit that I was assigned to (the [14th Infantry](#)) was distinguished by a golden dragon in front of a red wall, because—during the [Boxer Rebellion](#), in China—this unit had once [scaled the wall](#) of Peking in order to capture the city.

Over the years, both England and America have attempted to control the Chinese—England with its shameless [Opium Wars](#) and America with its [Yangtze River gunboat patrols](#)—yet the Chinese people have now, finally, freed themselves from the arrogant, wrong-headed, imperialist Anglo-Americans; although they still need to free themselves from their own dead, Marxist/Communist, totalitarian ideology—at least they are free of Anglo-American imperialism.

Great Britain has, over the years, tried—and failed—to [control Afghanistan](#) (to use as a buffer

between the British India colonies and Russia) just like America is trying—and failing—to do today.

Opium—the same opium the British once foisted upon the Chinese people—is Afghanistan's largest and most profitable export. And I assume that it always will be. Opium, as Martin Booth has said, has [a long history](#) and is an integral part of the global economy.

The old and collapsing British Empire is responsible the current crisis, which America (since World War II) has now inherited, in the Middle East. For example, even a cursory study of World War I will show that Palestine, which is what that land was then called, was stolen from the Palestinians by the British in order that it might be [given to the Zionist colonizers](#).

To this very day we are simply reaping the consequences of these arrogant, imperialist actions.

When will Anglo-Americans wake up, learn their history, admit the error of their ways, truly allow the peoples of other lands to determine their own destinies, butt-out of everyone's business, leave people in foreign lands alone, apologize for what we've done, humbly admit that our "empires" have collapsed, and start focusing on the problems that we have right here at home? Probably not until our "empires" are defeated—militarily—by our enemies; because, even though we're already financially bankrupt, we'll no doubt continue to hang on until [the very bitterest](#) of ends.

Security and Terrorism: *Reductio ad Absurdum*

Ever since [9/11](#), the US federal government has been working overtime trying to keep Americans afraid of terrorists, namely [al Qaeda](#) (who are [said to be](#) responsible for the attacks of that day). Since that time Americans have been subjected to a draconian infringement of their rights as citizens, namely through the infamous [USA PATRIOT ACT](#), so that Americans, we are told, might be [safe and secure](#).

This government [terror/fear mongering](#) now extends itself at the slightest provocation. Incidents such as the [underwear bomber](#) and the [Times Square fizzle bomber](#) come to mind here. Other incidents, such as the [Fort Hood shooter](#), have been declared *both* the act of a lone deranged gunman *and* the terrorist actions of a man who had been in contact, via email, with an al Qaeda cleric (who happens to be a US citizen and is now on President Obama's [US citizen hit list](#)).

The ancient philosopher [Socrates](#) used a line of questioning, the so-called [Socratic method](#), in order to get-at the truth of a matter by taking the premise of a person's argument to its logical conclusion; thereby showing the (eventual) absurdity of the person's premise. This type of argument, called [reduction ad absurdum](#), can be helpful in critiquing the US government's arguments concerning terrorism and homeland security.

[Terrorism is a tactic, it's not an entity](#). If terrorism is a real threat to Americans, then nothing short of a [total police state](#) can possibly be a solution.

And this is [exactly](#) where America is now headed.

Consider this: a terrorist can be a lone gunman, the driver of a car, or someone with a backpack. How-short of policing everyone, everywhere, all of the

time—does anyone suppose that the US government can keep Americans safe from the threat of terrorism?

This is the whole point of terrorism: it can't be stopped by police tactics. Terrorism will only end when oppressive governments, who are the targets of the attacks, decide to [address the political grievances](#) of the terrorists.

If we want to keep the American homeland safe from terrorist threats, then the US government needs to address the political grievances the terrorists have against it. For example, al Qaeda never struck first at America; al Qaeda reacted to the US government's decision to attack Iraq (killing thousands of innocent civilians) and to put US troops in [Saudi Arabia](#) in 1991 (which blasphemed the two holiest sites of Islam).

If government fear/terror mongering continues, then the US will, inevitably, become [a total police state](#).

Just as with [DUI checkpoints](#), in which everyone who is driving a car is suspected to be drunk, anyone who drives a [car](#) can now be considered a terror suspect; as is anyone who is carrying a [backpack](#); or anyone who carries their [lunch](#) to work.

If you don't believe me, then just think about it. If the Times Square fizzle bomb was a real threat, then how could it have been stopped? By searching every car that goes through a checkpoint before it can get to Times Square; right? Just like airport and sporting event screenings, access to all areas will, eventually, require screening.

So don't be surprised if, when you're driving somewhere, you're stopped at a checkpoint by the police, who [look like soldiers](#), and asked to prove that you *don't* have a bomb in your car. And don't be surprised if, when you're walking to class one day, you're stopped by the police, who [look like soldiers](#), and asked to prove that you're *not* carrying a bomb in your backpack.

The Enemy of Freedom

With all of the hoopla surrounding Arizona's new anti-immigration law one would think that the American people would have already realized that their constitutional rights, found especially in the Bill of Rights, had been eviscerated long ago.

Because of Arizona's new law, many people are now concerned that their Fourth Amendment right "to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures" is now—suddenly—being put in jeopardy. But under the USA PATRIOT ACT, anyone suspected of terrorism can have their homes invaded, listening devices placed within their homes, their phones tapped, and their papers seized (or copied).

But the American people are okay with this, because the Feds only do this to suspected *terrorists*. But the truth is that the USA PATRIOT ACT simply allowed the Feds to *expand* their already unconstitutional intelligence gathering methods, which they had been using against suspected *criminals* (i.e., suspected organized crime figures) who, for many years now, have also had their homes invaded, listening devices placed within their homes, their phones tapped, and their papers seized (or copied).

And the American people were okay with this as well. Why? Because organized crime figures are *criminals*. The *constitutional issue*, however, is the oft neglected fact that these *suspected* criminals happen to be *U. S. citizens* who are thereby (supposedly) entitled to the protections that are (supposedly) provided for *all* citizens by the U. S. Constitution and its *Bill of Rights*.

But when it comes to the Feds taking away our constitutional rights, the American people have a very bad habit of saying something like: "Well, if

you're not doing anything wrong, then you don't have anything to worry about."

But that's not really the point, is it?

The point of having constitutional rights is this: it is that when you are *suspected* of wrongdoing you have *protection* from the government, which is trying to find evidence against you in order to prosecute and convict you of that suspected wrongdoing.

Consider this too: the Feds (and the states) have been seizing (forfeiting) the property of suspected drug smugglers for years now; a direct violation of the protections afforded to all U. S. citizens by the Fifth Amendment, which states that no person shall be: ". . . deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation." But this is exactly what the authorities have been doing: seizing the property of suspected drug smugglers, before trial, and then using or selling that property for public use.

But this is okay with the American people, because these guys are (suspected) drug smugglers. I mean, "If you're not doing anything wrong, then you don't have anything to worry about" . . . right?

I got in trouble with the Feds about eight years ago, concerning an anti-abortion incident I was involved in, and I was surprised when the state that I was living in at the time decided to prosecute me for the same offense. I thought, "Isn't such double prosecution a violation of my Fifth Amendment right to protection from the government putting me on trial twice for the same offense?"

The Fifth Amendment says: ". . .nor shall any person be subjected for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy . . ." I could see if I had committed two, distinctly different offenses, but the prosecution, in both my federal and state trials, accused me—in court—of having done one, specific thing—the same thing. This, to me, was exactly what

the Fifth Amendment was supposed to protect me from: being put on trial twice *for the same offense*.

Imagine my surprise when, in doing legal research for my (state) case, I came across a U. S. Supreme Court case from 1959 ([Bartkus v. Illinois](#)) in which the court had decided—before I was born—that it was okay for someone to be put on trial twice for the same offense in America . . . as long as the government used to *different courts* in which to do so: a *federal court* and a *state court* (a [legal fiction](#) since known as [dual sovereignty](#)).

In *Bartkus v. Illinois*, Mr. Bartkus had been tried and found not guilty (i.e., *acquitted*) of the charge of bank robbery in U. S. federal court; he was then prosecuted by the state of Illinois in state court *for the same offense* (i.e., the (alleged) robbery of the same bank). Unfortunately for Mr. Bartkus, he was found guilty this time, and he was subsequently sentenced to serve twenty years in prison. He took his case to the U. S. Supreme Court and the court upheld the verdict, claiming dual sovereignty (i.e., that each *sovereign* (*federal* and *state*) had the right to prosecute him for the *same offense*: bank robbery).

U. S. Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black dissented in the case, and he also wrote one of most scathing [dissenting opinions](#) in the history of the court, which I think you should read (by following the link above).

In Black's opinion, the court had overturned the U. S. citizen's right to be protected from double prosecution—a right that has existed throughout the legal history of western civilization since ancient times. As Justice Black put it, "The court apparently takes the position that a second trial for the same act is somehow less offensive if one of the trials is conducted by the Federal Government and the other by a State. Looked at from the standpoint of the individual who is being prosecuted, this notion is too subtle for me to grasp. If double punishment is what is feared, it hurts no less for two "Sovereigns" to inflict it than for one."

I can attest to the truth of this opinion: it was no less offensive to me. Having to prepare for two trials, and having to prepare to go to prison twice, for the same offense was certainly offensive to me.

I'm saying all of this to point up the fact that we Americans have lost, long ago, many of the constitutional rights that are supposed to guarantee us protection from our government, which most of us (somehow) still assume that we have.

We don't have them, and many of them we haven't had for a long, long time.

Is all of the hoopla surrounding the new Arizona law justified? I think that it is, because—ideally—law enforcement should *not* be allowed to ask people in America to "show their papers". However, considering the many rights that we have already lost, only a few of which I've enumerated above, does anyone actually believe they are still afforded the legal protections from government that we were once afforded us by the Bill of Rights, but which are now virtually null and void?

My real concern is that America needs to be restored to its ideals. The American people require the restoration of their rights and their protections from government, which were (long ago) outlined for us in the *Bill of Rights*.

Until we—the People—decide get off our apathy, we're all in danger; not just the Hispanics. In fact, the Hispanics are in endangered now simply because we—the People—have let this issue (and the federal government) get so out-of-hand. The sad truth is that the U. S. federal government has now become the real enemy of our freedom, and I think it's high time the American people wake up and begin taking responsibility for their government in order to regain their rights and their protections from the government by taking the federal government back into the hands of the People. Perhaps this Arizona controversy will help us to do just that.

The Future of America Depends Upon Justice for the Unborn

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King once said: "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." Dr. Seuss once said: "A person's a person, no matter how small."

I agree.

Last month I was working with a fine young Christian man—the kind of young Christian person who inspires hope for the future and can be found across this great nation— who said something that really surprised me. He said something to the effect of, "I think abortion is okay as long as it's right after conception (like via "the morning after pill") or still very young/small."

I think I said something like, "So all that matters is that we kill them when they're small . . . preferably by chemicals, as opposed to scalpels. But the point here is that one has to have a justifiable reason to take a human life and to have an abortion is to intentionally destroy a human life. Simply not wanting a little someone around is not just cause for taking a human life, no matter how small/young it is."

I also told him two stories from my own life-experience. The first was that, when we were young teenagers, my best friend got his girlfriend pregnant and, because they didn't want her parents to find out they were having sex, they aborted the child. My friend and his girlfriend later married and had three kids. I think her parents figured out that they were having sex. This couple, especially the woman, always regretted having aborted their first, who would have been their oldest, child.

The second story is that of my ex-wife. She got pregnant at 16 (not by me) and hid it from her mom until it was too late to get an abortion, which is what her mom (not my ex-wife) wanted to do. She had

the child, a boy, and she gave him up for adoption. He contacted her when he turned 18 and they have been corresponding ever since. He's very happy to be alive, knowing he could have been aborted, he's very happy with his life, and he's also a very successful businessman.

And that's a lot better than ending up in the toilet, or in the garbage can, isn't it?

Life is unique; especially human life.

I once watched [Bill Moyers](#) interview [Dr. Leon Kass, MD](#) on PBS. Dr. Kass is one of the brightest thinkers in America, and he's also a distinguished bioethicist (whose books I've read). The following is an excerpt from [this interview](#),

BILL MOYERS: You mean down when we were mere cells?

LEON KASS: When we were--

BILL MOYERS: Or a cell?

LEON KASS: We were a very special kind of cell, Bill.

BILL MOYERS: Potentially.

LEON KASS: No, no. We were-- when you-- look, when-- R.G. Edwards created the first test tube baby, Louise Brown, 1978, he said, and he sort of stumbled over the truth. He said, "She was beautiful then and she is beautiful now." And by "then" he meant when she was a zygote, when she was a fertilized egg which he had fertilized.

What really struck me was just how little Bill Moyers thinks of human life in its earliest stages.

Just like the young man I worked with.

Dr. Kass is a wise man who is in awe of life, especially human life, and he realizes the continuity, over time, of our being. We were all zygotes once. I, the person who I am now, this body, was once as small as the period at the end of this sentence.

"We were a very special kind of cell, Bill."

I suppose "the morning after pill" is a conscience relieving solution to an unwanted pregnancy. Unwanted pregnancy? Simply swallow a pill and your pregnancy is over!

Sounds like the modern, scientific, and merciful way to kill your unborn child. If they're really small they won't feel anything . . .

Mercy is one of the reasons the guy that I used to work with gave me for using "the morning after pill" or getting an abortion early: they don't feel any pain.

But who are *they*?

They are the same *kind* as us: people.

"Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind and therefore never send to ask for whom the bell tolls it tolls for thee." ~ [John Donne](#)

By saying this Donne is telling us much the same thing as Dr. King was telling us when he said: "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." What Donne is saying is that we're a small part of a much larger human family and that we're all mortal. When the bell tolls the death of anyone, it may as well be my own death, because sooner or later I will die. The death of anyone is a loss to the human family of a unique individual. In the case of abortion, the death of each human being via abortion is, in a sense, the death of us all, because the single, unwanted human zygote, embryo, or fetus is a microcosm of humanity. The unjust,

intentional putting to death of a single, small, growing human being through abortion is the death of us all, because we turn our head and ignore, for the most part, the deathly matter.

Are YOU going to be the one to kill it? Whatever size it is? I'm not.

Not if it's human. Sorry.

And HUMAN it is; it being: *the small person (people or them)*.

I realize that pseudo intellectuals like [Peter Singer](#) would have us (i.e., our society) allow for abortion and infanticide (i.e., the murder of infants up to two years of age) but I think Dr. King would really have issues with such inhumane and murderously brutal injustices as abortion and infanticide.

[Wouldn't he?](#)

Abortion and infanticide are based, philosophically, upon a genocidal instinct that transcends ordinary classifications of hatred, which becomes an existential hatred for the bodily existence of another person (however small). This (small) person's nationality, religion, gender, and race are irrelevant; the intention of abortion and infanticide being to destroy a human life simply *because it exists*.

Notice how, in the dialogue above, Moyer's use of *potential* life is summarily dismissed by Dr. Kass.

You weren't a *potential* human life, or person, when you were a zygote Bill; you were you: a living, growing, human person . . . the same—although much more mature—unique human person that you are right now (e.g., same blood type, same unique DNA).

In the aftermath of [the 9/11 attacks](#) on the World Trade Center in New York City, "The medical examiner's office received a total of 19,916 human remains, which included fewer than 300 intact bodies

or torsos. It identified 10,190 body parts, some as small as a finger tip, primarily through [DNA testing](#). About 9,726 remains remain unidentified."

Although we don't like to think about it, the finger tip of an unborn child who has been legally killed by an abortionist would also be identified as being "human remains."

In short, this is indisputable scientific evidence that the unborn child is a human being. But we already knew that, didn't we?

Isn't that the point, after all, of killing it to begin with? Because *it*—a living, growing, human being—is; it exists here-and-now and we *don't want it to*?

So we desire a humane way of being rid of this . . . human.

Better than [carving it up](#) into little pieces—not as ugly, or as brutal, in appearance.

Suffice it to say that, in this case—concerning Kass and Moyers—Dr. Kass comes across as much wiser than the average person which, in this case, is represented by Moyers.

Size (or age), in this case, doesn't matter.

Injustice anywhere—like the unjust taking of a human life through abortion—is a threat to justice everywhere.

Ask not whom the abortionist kills, he's killing you . . . he's killing us all; in microcosm . . . the purest form of genocide (or [specicide](#)).

Believe it or not, the biggest obstacle to political reformation, now, is the abortion issue. Why? Because the Left, which is supposed to stand for human rights supports, for the most part, a woman's right to choose to hire an abortionist, usually a

man, and pay him to kill her child (unless of course she's using the "more humane" morning after pill).

The Right, which has no history of supporting the oppressed, like the Left does, has picked up the human rights banner which the Left dropped (i.e., the banner of the smallest amongst us, the not-yet-born) and managed to gather most of the pro-lifers into its party. The Left, which perceives the abortion issue as irrevocably tied to the women's rights issue could easily become the party of life and justice, thus transferring most of the pro-lifers from the Right into its own party, if the Left would simply acknowledge the truth: abortion is the intentional, violent destruction of an innocent human person.

Women have rights in our society. They have equal rights with men. But neither a man nor a woman has any right to kill an unborn person. Some jealous, angry husbands will always seek out their cheating spouse's lover in order to kill him. But this doesn't mean that the state (i.e., the government) should legalize such killings. Likewise, women (and men) will always seek to be rid of their unborn children. But that doesn't mean that the state (meaning: the government) should legalize such killings.

What would [Dr. King](#) say . . . ? Can you imagine? And why is no one else, of any popular significance, saying it?

What's happened to justice? Human rights cannot be [in subjection to women's rights](#), or to men's rights. These rights are innate; inviolate, God-given.

And that was Dr. King's whole point, wasn't it? Equal rights for all people via [Natural Law](#) . . . as outlined for us in the [Declaration of Independence](#)?

I had a rather unique perspective of Glenn Beck's recent rally at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D. C. I walked from Dupont Circle to the rally that morning and, as I was walking down 16th street, only a few blocks from the White House, I passed by the Planned Parenthood at 16th and L and, as you can

imagine (or maybe you can't) it was very busy, being a Saturday, which, apparently, is a good (i.e., popular, or common) day for the unborn to die.

Tens of thousands of pro-lifers at were at the Beck rally . . . but not at the clinic, in order to protest¹. Hundreds of people were at the anti-Beck rally, not far from the Lincoln Memorial, attempting to make Dr. King's dream of a more just society a reality. But they weren't at the clinic either. Worse yet, most of them support the operation of such (small people) killing centers.

"A person's a person, no matter how small . . ."

It's time for America, meaning the American people, to reconcile human rights to the abortion issue . . . to seek justice. If the Democrats would rethink the abortion issue through the lens of Dr. King's Natural Law paradigm the Republicans would go back to being their old rich, fat cat, country club selves.

Support Life!

Consistently!

End war, end abortion, end poverty, end racism, end capital punishment . . . and seek instead to build a culture of life!

And Justice!

¹ There was a very small group of Catholics there.

Choose Life – March for Life 2011

It's time again for the annual [March for Life](#), which is a peaceful pro-life (anti-abortion) march (protest). The March for Life commemorates, in memoriam, the 1973 US Supreme Court decision (in [Roe v. Wade](#)) which legalized abortion on demand throughout all fifty states. This year marks its thirty-eighth year and I wonder how much longer it will take for America to become a nation that loves and promotes life rather than one that loves and promotes death.

A [recent news story](#) confirmed something that I [wrote](#) not long ago: the dirty little secret about abortion and the 1973 Roe v. Wade decision is that legalizing abortion simply allowed the [back-alley butchers](#) to move onto Main Street (or, in this case, [Lancaster Avenue](#)). Perhaps the Philly [House of Horrors](#) will be a [wake-up](#) call for many? For many people, however, such as myself, the house of horrors in Philly was [no surprise](#), because we've been awake to this issue for quite some time. An abortionist is usually [a lousy doctor](#)—much better at killing people than at healing them—often having graduated at-or-near the bottom of their medical school class, who makes a living killing babies.

On Monday January 24, 2011, tens of thousands of Americans will [march](#) in Washington, DC to demonstrate their support of a [culture of life](#), one in which the intentional, violent destruction of a human being of any age is not permitted by law. Choose life, and [justice for the unborn](#).

"Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

A World Without Nukes: Dream? or Nightmare?

"A world without nukes would be the ultimate nightmare. We voluntarily disarm while the world's rogues and psychopaths develop nukes in secret."
Charles Krauthammer (Washington Post, [11/26/2010](#))

"A world without nukes would be the ultimate nightmare." That's a very strong statement, which most people, I think, would strongly disagree with. I think most people hope, someday, to live in a nuclear weapon-free world. So what, exactly, is Krauthammer's reason for making such a statement? Krauthammer's a writer, and I'm a writer too. Writers write sentence by sentence, it doesn't matter whether it's a newspaper column or a book, so why does Krauthammer say that "A world without nukes would be an ultimate nightmare"?

Writers are also careful with the words they use. The words "world", "nukes", "ultimate", "nightmare" are packed with meaning and Krauthammer intends to pack a punch with them . . . to persuade his readers to follow his point of view, which is the establishment's point of view. Writer's, especially those, like Krauthammer, who are well paid to engage in social/political polemics on a regular basis, are likewise prone to misuse words in order to persuade those who disagree with their views. Their writings should always be read very carefully, with suspicion. For example, Krauthammer, here, equates a nuclear weapon-free world ([many people's](#) hope/dream) with a nightmare. Worse yet: an "ultimate nightmare".

The late (murdered) president John F. Kennedy once said:

"What kind of peace do we seek? Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace - - the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living -- the kind that enables man and nations to grow and to hope

and to build a better life for their children - - not merely peace for Americans by peace for all men and women - - not merely peace in our time but peace for all time.

I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all of the allied air forces in the Second World War. It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by the wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations unborn." John F. Kennedy, Commencement Speech at American University ([06/10/1963](#))

I agree with Kennedy. And I find Krauthammer's misuse of words regarding this subject repugnant. Krauthammer want's to persuade his readers into believing that a [Pax Americana](#) enforced on the world by American (nuclear) weapons of war is our only hope/dream and tries to convince them, by a subtle [equivocation of terms](#), that we are in mortal peril if we *don't* have this Pax Americana. For Krauthammer, "a world without nukes" = "a world in which rogues and psychopaths develop nukes in secret". But these two things, "a world without nukes" and "a world in which rogues and psychopaths develop nukes in secret" are *not* the same, or equivalent.

Like Kennedy, I think it's foolish—and very dangerous—for nations to arm for total nuclear war "in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all of the allied air forces in the Second World War". What does this—an end to the nuclear arms race and disarmament—have to do with "rogues and psychopaths developing nukes in secret"? Surely Krauthammer knows there will always be rogues and psychopaths—or sociopaths—amongst us . . . why does he tell us we invite disaster—an "ultimate nightmare scenario"—if we choose to scale back or even lay down our national nuclear offensive/defensive capabilities? Kennedy's

dream of a nuclear-free world wasn't/isn't a nightmare, Krauthammer's dream of a world with nukes, with the US enforcing a [new](#) Pax Americana, taking out rogue nations and psychopathic dictators, is the [real](#) nightmare.

If we're looking for rogues and psychopaths (better: *sociopaths*) the world, especially since 9/11, has indeed been threatened by them. Two names, in particular, come to mind here: [Donald Rumsfeld and Richard Cheney](#).

I, for one, hope for and dream of a nuclear-free future, one in which generations unborn can be free from the threat of nuclear annihilation. Krauthammer, apparently, does not.

And I'm not the only one either . . . far from it, there's a [global resistance](#) of nuclear weapons.

Is it Okay to be Gay?

If, when posing the question "is it okay to be gay?", we mean "are gays, lesbians, and bisexuals second-class citizens?", then the answer to the question "is it okay to be gay" (in America) is clearly: "yes, being gay is okay—being gay does *not* make anyone a second-class citizen." But if when posing the question "is it okay to be gay?" we mean "is being gay the same as, equal to, or just-as-good-as being straight?", then I think the answer to the question "is it okay to be gay?" is clearly "no, being gay is not okay—being gay is *not* the same as or just-as-good-as being straight."

This is a subject to which I have devoted much thought, both because it is a hot-button issue these days and because I have had—and I do have—many friends who were—and who are—gay, lesbian, and bisexual.

As an American and as a libertarian, I don't care who is having sex with whom, as long as it's consensual sex and as long as no one is being harmed or abused against their will. It's none of my business. I think gays, lesbians, and bisexuals should be allowed equal protection under the law. They should be allowed to work any job for which they are qualified, be allowed to serve in the military, be allowed to join in civil unions (the marriage issue is, I think, a religious matter; which is up to one's church), and they should be allowed to parent children.

As a Christian, I believe homosexuality is a sin. And I also believe that heterosexual adultery and promiscuity is a sin. I'm of the opinion that God, in his mercy, warns us against giving-in to our sinful desires because he knows what's best for us. He knows that engaging in homosexual sex, heterosexual adultery, and promiscuity is not what's best for us. In fact, engaging in sinful behavior can make us quite miserable.

Sinful desires are quite natural for us to have, as is our desire to give-in to them, which is why our Creator warns us not to give-in to them. But I don't see our Creator as a stern judge, chomping at the bit to throw sinners into hell. I believe our Creator loves us, wants what's best for us, and wants us to be happy. Our Creator knows that when we give-in to our sinful desires, we won't be as happy; not as happy as we could be. In fact, we're often miserable because of such giving-in.

My belief is that promiscuous and adulterous heterosexuals, as well as homosexuals and bisexuals (even if they're *not* being promiscuous and unfaithful) are simply not as happy as they could be; and not as happy as they should be (i.e., not as happy as our Creator desires for them to be).

In short, these sexual lifestyles are not ideal, or what's best for us.

The ideal sexual relationship is one in which a woman and a man love one another, complement one another, treat each other equally, are faithful to one another sexually, and are forgiving and kind to one another when they (inevitably) fall short of these ideals.

Heterosexual relationships are by no means easy, but they are worth the effort; especially if we desire to live-up to our full potential, as human persons.

I think the practice of homosexuality is a refusal to accept (or a denial of) the many challenges of growth and development that are associated with developing the healthy, fulfilling, and ideal emotional and sexual relationship that one can only form with a member of the opposite sex.

This refusal or denial makes the practice of homosexuality "incest-like", because intra-gender emotional and sexual relationships take place "within the family" of one's own gender. Healthy growth and development cannot occur when one locks oneself

emotionally and sexually into one family (a biological family, a gender family, or both). In order to grow and develop healthy relationships one must leave the safety, security, and familiarity of the family, however difficult this may be for one to do.

The word *genus* comes from the Latin word *genre-*, *genus*; [meaning](#): birth, race, or kind. The word *gender* has the same [meaning](#). Also related to this same (Latin) word is the word *generate*, which [means](#): descent, birth (see also: [kin](#)). The word: *geneology*, from the Greek word: *genea*, *genos*, [meaning](#): race, family.

This is why I say that homosexuality is "incest-like", because *gender* is like *family*. Sexual activity within one's own gender (intra-gender) is sexual activity within one's own gender-family.

The word *family* comes from the Latin word: *familia*, [meaning](#): household, and is related to the word: *race*. And in biological classification ([taxonomy](#)), the *family* is just above the *genus*.

The relationship between the two words *gender* and *family* is readily apparent.

Although there's been a lot of deliberate confusion today regarding the word *gender*, which I've dealt with [elsewhere](#), the word *gender* is [equivalent to](#) the word *sex*, [meaning](#): *male* and *female* kinds.

What concerns me is that our society is sending people the message that "being gay is okay"—meaning: "being gay is just-as-good-as being straight"—when, in reality, being gay is not just-as-good-as being straight.

What concerns me even more is when some Christians, and some Christian churches, send the message that "being gay is just-as-good-as being straight"; because it's not.

(I'm especially concerned that some organizations are telling children that "being gay is okay-or just-as-good-as being straight".)

Sending this false message does people (especially young people) a great disservice. We should be telling people the truth, that "being gay is not as good as being straight"—being homosexual will never allow one to be as happy as one could be, and as one should be, by being heterosexual. As difficult as it may be (at times) to tell people the truth, telling people the truth about a serious issue is not an option, especially for Christians and Christian churches.

It's especially disappointing knowing that my Christian friend has bought—and is selling—the lie: that "being gay is just as good as being straight".

Telling the truth is hard, but it's the right thing to do, especially if you really care about people and if you really desire for them to reach their best potential.

One of the most important theological points, which I made above, is that people have been created by God in the image of God, and that the image of God is *both* male and female *together*.

People image God as both male and female *together*; not as male and male together or as female and female together. God is neither female nor male but has aspects of both, and is best imaged by *female and male together as one*. Genesis 1:27 tells us, "So God created man [i.e., humankind] in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them." Men and woman are very different, and both men and women need one another in order to complement one another.

This is the theological reason for why it's not ideal for a child to have same-sex parents. In order to image God, in the family, one must have *both* a female *and* a male (both a mother and a father) and not a female and a female (a mother and a mother) or

a male and a male (a father and a father). The best way to image God to a child is for the child to have both a mother and a father; both of whom love one another, respect one another, and, most importantly, *complement* one another.

Should same sex families be allowed in America? Sure. But these same-sex families are *not* "just as good as" opposite-sex families. And we're fooling ourselves if we think they are.

This is not easy for me to say but I've never hesitated to express my concerns about these important issues, especially to my gay, lesbian, and bisexual friends; some of whom have same-sex families. I'm very tolerant, but I also love people and I want what's best for them. And this means telling them the truth: homosexuality, very simply, is not "the same as, or just as good as, heterosexuality".

Additional—

As I was working on this post, I received an update regarding a new [blog post](#), concerning homosexuality and the church, written by a friend of mine who is in seminary. Sadly, my friend is telling people (although not as plainly) that "being gay is just as good as being straight". In response to his post, I wrote the following, which is rather technical and may not be of interest to the general reader. It deals with male homosexuality and the definitions of the New Testament Greek words relating to it:

As Christian theologians, we accept the concept of progressive revelation. The NT is a better (more clear) revelation than is the OT, but the revelation of God in the NT is not *radically different from* the revelation of God in the OT.

Unless we wish to be like [Marcion](#) and dispose of the OT altogether.

As for the definitions of the Greek words *arsenokoites* and *malakos*, I think you know as well as

I do that--when it comes to writing books and papers dealing with the definitions of NT Greek words--we should agree to accept the standard scholarly reference work of our day: [A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament](#) (Univ. of Chicago Press); also known as the Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich lexicon (or BAG).

You say there is no consensus of scholarship regarding the words *arsenokoites* and *malakos*, but the BAG lexicon *is a scholarly consensus*. In fact it's the only lexicon that's universally accepted by NT scholars.

If we wish to be intellectually honest, and if we expect other scholars to give credence to our work, we should be willing to settle debates over NT Greek word definitions by the BAG lexicon.

According to the BAG lexicon, the word *arsenokoites* means: "a male who practices homosexuality, pederast, sodomite."

I know this isn't popular these days, but it's what the word means; at least according to the standard, scholarly reference work of our day.

According to the BAG lexicon, the word *malakos* means: "men and boys who allow themselves to be misused homosexually."

You can easily look up these two words in the BAG lexicon for yourself, as I just did, because I'm sure you guys must have one in your library.

And please don't get me wrong here.

I understand the issue of homosexuality and the church very well. I've had, and do have, many friends who were, and are, homosexual. But I don't think homosexuality is an ideal lifestyle that is equivalent with heterosexuality. I think engaging in homosexuality in preference to heterosexuality is immature in that it hinders our growth as persons made in the image of God. People image God as both male and female *together*; not as male and male together or as female and female together.

God is neither female nor male but has aspects of both, and is best imaged by female and male *together* as one. Genesis 1:27 tells us,

"So God created man [i.e., humankind] in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them."

I try very hard not to allow myself to twist the meanings of words in order to make myself or others feel better about our behavior choices. And I accept the BAG lexicon regarding NT Greek word definitions, letting the chips fall where they may. I think we're on very thin ice when we find ourselves arguing against it.

You may also find this [article](#), concerning the etymologies of the words *arsenkoites* and *malakos*, to be of interest as well.

Political Observations 2011

US Government Illegitimate

The US federal government has no legitimacy and many people are beginning to realize it. For many people my age, 9/11 was only the most recent, not the first, deadly federal [terror attack](#) upon the innocent American peoples. I remember incidents like [Ruby Ridge](#), the [World Trade Center](#) bombing, [Waco](#), and the [Oklahoma City](#) bombing.

Many people my age remember these events, and how the feds had become so murderously heavy-handed. Younger people, who have no memory of these events, should take notice of them.

At the time of the Oklahoma City bombing, [many people suspected](#) that explosives had been planted in the Murrah federal building long before the bombing occurred on April 19, 1995, because the damage to the building was [so much greater](#) than that which could have been caused by Timothy McVeigh's (and [others' unknown](#)) ANFO truck bomb and [General Partin](#) said as much at the time.

The Murrah federal building, it appeared to many, had been prewired with explosives. And, just as it was at [Mount Carmel](#) in Waco, Texas, all evidence from the Oklahoma City bombing crime scene was appropriated by the feds and the crime scene itself destroyed. (The demolition of the Murrah building was entrusted to the establishment connected firm: [Controlled Demolition](#); the same firm hired by the feds to clean up the [WTC](#) crime scene immediately after 9/11.) In short, the Oklahoma City bombing was [an inside job](#).

The growing awareness that [WTC building 7](#) was intentionally brought down by [controlled demolition](#) is causing many to conclude that if one building was [brought down](#) by [controlled demolition](#) on 9/11, WTC building 7, then WTC buildings 1 and 2 must also have

been [brought down by controlled demolition](#). [9/11](#), too, was [an inside job](#).

Thus the US federal government has, in the minds of many peoples, no legitimacy.

I, for one, have [had it](#) with the feds. I'm far beyond the belated anger of the [TEA](#) partiers . . . reform, in my thinking, is impossible. If reform means wasting valuable time and energy with the corrupted election system. The worst thing that ever happened to the TEA Party is that it went from being a good protest movement to being part of the Republican [establishment](#).

Those who have lost loved ones in Oklahoma City and New York must deal with the fact that those responsible for murders of their loved ones are beyond the reach of law. Some [parents](#) in America live with this fact on a daily basis. As in [Mexico](#), so it is in [America](#): corrupt, rich, and powerful politicians get away with murder. [Justice](#) and the rule of law has given way to [the will to power](#).

It's up to us, [the American People](#), to [take our nation back](#) from these thugs. To regain legitimacy for our national government as a government that governs [by consent](#) of its People. I think those who have lost loved ones in this struggle are leading the way. And it's time for us to follow their lead and to seek justice.

Rachael Maddow's Faulty Gun-Control Argument

O n a recent [broadcast](#), Rachael Maddow said that it's extremist for one to believe that an armed citizenry prevents government tyranny.

I believe that an armed citizenry prevents tyranny, which is exactly why the Founders gave us the Second Amendment to the US Constitution. I suppose the British and their supporters in the colonies thought the Founders were extremists too?

Rachael's argument that, if the above interpretation of the Second Amendment is correct, then citizens must (should) be allowed to buy any and all types of weaponry, is, I think, a good one (my personal favorite: the [reductio ad absurdum](#)) but she starts off with a faulty premise: that US citizens would need to be able to defeat (she says "destroy"), on the battlefield, the US military. This premise is faulty because US citizens don't need to defeat (or destroy) the US military; all we need to do is to make life miserable for the US military, which is what the Vietnamese, the Iraqis, and the Afghanis have done.

(Ever heard the terms "asymmetric warfare" and "insurgency" Rachael? I remember when the US invaded Iraq and a \$12,000,000 Apache helicopter was shot down by an Iraqi insurgent using a \$300 AK-47 and 20 cent bullets!)

And, in case Rachael has forgotten, the US did fight a Civil War. [The Battle of Gettysburg](#) was fought only 15 miles from where I live, and the town that I live in has the distinction of being the only Union town to have been [burned](#) by the Confederates (in this case, in retaliation for the Union's earlier decimation of Virginia's Shenandoah Valley).

Thousands of men have already fought and died resisting federal tyranny Rachael, in case you've forgotten. If federal tyranny ever does need to be resisted again it will be resisted by men with arms that have been legally obtained and possessed. We will not need nukes, rocket launchers, and tanks to

defeat the US military, because we don't need to defeat it, we only need to harass it continually until they (us?) eventually quit and switch sides.

Perhaps Rachael's real concern should be with those who are in the US military and those who are in our many local, state, and federal police departments? Many of these people take the US Constitution---and the [oath](#) they've sworn to defend it---very seriously. And why shouldn't they? After all, these folks are US citizens too. Just like [Robert E. Lee](#) was.

Several Quotes taken from the (extremist) Founders concerning an armed citizenry

Thomas Jefferson

"No free man shall ever be debarred the use of arms. The strongest reason for the people to retain the right to keep and bear arms is, as a last resort, to protect themselves against tyranny in government." -- Thomas Jefferson, proposed Virginia constitution, June 1776. Thomas Jefferson Papers, 334 (C. J. Boyd, Ed., 1950)

"Laws that forbid the carrying of arms disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes. Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to encourage than prevent homicides, for an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man." --Thomas Jefferson, quoting 18th century criminologist Cesare Beccaria in "On Crimes and Punishment", 1764

When the government fears the people, there is liberty. When the people fear the government, there is tyranny --Thomas Jefferson

"And what country can preserve it's liberties, if the rulers are not warned from time to time that this people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take up arms. The tree of liberty must be refreshed

from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants." --Thomas Jefferson, Letter to William S. Smith, 1787

"The Constitution of most of our states, and the United States, assert that all power is inherent in the people; that they may exercise it by themselves: that it is their right and duty to be at all times armed; that they are entitled to freedom of person, freedom of religion, freedom of property, and freedom of the press." Thomas Jefferson, Proposed Virginia Constitution, 1776

Samuel Adams

"Among the natural rights of the colonists are these: first, a right to life, secondly to liberty, thirdly to property; together with the right to defend them in the best manner they can." --Samuel Adams

"The Constitution shall never be construed to prevent the people of the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms." --Samuel Adams, During the Massachusetts U.S. Constitution ratification convention, 1788

"If you love wealth better than liberty, the tranquillity of servitude better than the animating contest of freedom, go home from us in peace. We ask not your counsels or arms. Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you. May your chains set lightly upon you and may posterity forget that ye were our countrymen." -- Samuel Adams, 1776

Benjamin Franklin

"Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety." --Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790), reply of the Pennsylvania Assembly to the governor, November 11, 1755 <<later, motto of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, c. 1759>>

Noah Webster

"Before a standing army can rule, the people must be disarmed; as they are in almost every kingdom of Europe. the supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword; because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force superior to any bands of regular troops that can be, on any pretense, raised in the United States." --Noah Webster, An Examination into the Leading Principles of the federal Constitution (1787) in Pamphlets to the Constitution of the United States (P. Ford, 1888).

Tench Coxe

"Congress have no power to disarm the militia. Their swords, and every other terrible implement of the soldier, are the birthright of an American... The unlimited power of the sword is not in the hands of either the federal or state government, but, where I trust in God it will ever remain, in the hands of the people" --Tench Coxe, Pennsylvania Gazette, Feb. 20, 1788

"As civil rulers, not having their duty to the people duly before them, may attempt to tyrannize, as the military forces which must be occasionally raised to defend our country, might pervert their power to the injury of their fellow citizens, the people are confirmed by the article in their right to keep and bear their private arms." Tench Coxe, in "Remarks on the First Part of the Amendments to the Federal Constitution." Philadelphia Federal Gazette, June 18, 1789

John Adams

"Arms in the hands of citizens may be used at the individual discretion, in private self-defense." John Adams, A Defense of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America, 1787-88

Alexander Hamilton

"The best we can hope for concerning the people at large is that they be properly armed." Alexander Hamilton, The Federalist Papers at 184-8

Richard Henry Lee

"A militia when properly formed are in fact the people themselves and include all men capable of bearing arms. To preserve liberty it is essential that the whole body of people always possess arms and be taught alike, especially when young, how to use them." Richard Henry Lee, Initiator of the Declaration of Independence, and member of the first Senate, which passed the Bill of Rights. Additional Letters From the Federal Farmer 53, 1788

Patrick Henry

"Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect everyone who approaches that jewel. Unfortunately, nothing will preserve it but downright force. Whenever you give up that force, you are ruined. The great object is that every man be armed. Every man who is able may have a gun." --Patrick Henry, During Virginia's ratification convention, 1788

James Madison

"The Constitution preserves the advantage of being armed which Americans possess over the people of almost every other nation where the governments are afraid to trust the people with arms." James Madison, The Federalist No. 46

"The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. A well regulated militia, composed of the body of people, trained in arms, is the best and most natural defense of a free country." --James Madison, 1 Annals of Congress 434 (June 8, 1789)

George Mason

"I ask sir, what is the militia? It is the whole people. To disarm the people is the best and most effectual way to enslave them." --George Mason, during Virginia's ratification convention, 1788

Thomas Paine

"Arms discourage and keep the invader and plunderer in awe, and preserve order in the world as well as property. Horrid mischief would ensue were the law-abiding deprived the use of them." --Thomas Paine, Thoughts on Defensive War, 1775

George Washington

"A free people ought to be armed. When firearms go, all goes, we need them by the hour. Firearms stand next to importance to the Constitution itself. They are the American people's liberty teeth and keystone under independence." --George Washington, Boston Independence Chronicle, January 14, 1790

"To ensure peace, security, and happiness, the rifle and pistol are equally indispensable. The very atmosphere of firearms everywhere restrains evil interference - they deserve a place of honor with all that is good." --George Washington, The Federalist No. 53



The Day I was DONE with Israel and the US Government - March 30, 2002

I was DONE with Israel on March 30, 2002, which was Holy Saturday that year, when the Israeli military ([IDF](#)) was shooting Palestinian fighters who had [taken refuge](#) in the Church of the Nativity. On March 29, 2002, which was Good Friday that

year, the IDF began [Operation "Defensive Wall"](#) (or Defensive Shield) in the West Bank by arresting Palestinian leaders, imprisoning PNA Chairman Yassar Arafat in the "Mukata" compound in [Ramallah](#), and besieging militants in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem.

The photograph I chose for this article is not random. In fact, it holds much meaning for me. The photo was taken March 29, 2002 in Palestine, just outside Yassar Arafat's compound in Ramallah. The men in the photo are two of Arafat's security guards, one of whom has just been mortally wounded by an IDF sniper. The photo appeared in the newspaper (where I lived) the following day, March 30, 2002, and it was obvious to me that the man in the photo had been mortally wounded at the instant the photo was taken, because I could see that he had let go of his rifle, which he would never have done unless he were already dead. When I looked at that photo that morning; and saw that [Palestinian fighter](#), who was not a young man; I put myself in his place, fighting many years for [the freedom of my homeland](#); freedom from the invaders and the oppressors: [Israel](#).

Along with the photo came [the story](#), of how the IDF were besieging Palestinian fighters in the [Church of the Nativity](#), in Bethlehem, and were doing their best to kill Arafat in his compound, in Ramallah. As this occurred not long after 9/11, war-fever was in the air. The US had invaded Afghanistan in order to go after al Qaeda ([Operation "ENDURING FREEDOM"](#)), and Israel was using the toxic atmosphere to go after their enemies: Arafat and the Palestinians.

Killing people who were fighting for their freedom, [holed up](#) in the Church of the Nativity, on Holy Saturday? I was DONE with Israel.

I had been very suspicious about who was behind the events of 9/11 since the day they occurred, because I had seen [no evidence](#) that what the US government said concerning [American Airlines flight 77 having crashed into the Pentagon](#) was true. I had seen [no evidence](#) that [a large jet aircraft](#) had hit the Pentagon, and I [still haven't](#) seen any evidence of such *to this day*.

For me, the notion that rogue elements of the US government might, in fact, be responsible for the terror attacks of 9/11 was not off-the-wall, nor was it off-the-table as a possible, even probable, explanation for who was actually responsible for the murder of over 3,000 people on [September 11, 2001](#). The [Oklahoma City bombing](#) had occurred April 19, 1995, almost seven years prior to March 30, 2002, and I was well aware of the fact that [the ATF had had advance knowledge of the bombing](#), which was to occur that day, and had allowed it to [go forward](#) (killing 168 people, including 19 children, and injuring 680). I was also aware of the fact that the [1993 plot to bomb the World Trade Center](#) in New York City had been [monitored by the FBI and allowed to go forward](#) as well (killing six people and injuring thousands more).

DONE with the US government? I was DONE!

And that was many years ago. How [DONE](#) do you think I am NOW?

[9/11](#) is, in fact, a thirty-year conspiracy, which was carried out by [rogue elements](#) of our own government (with [the assistance](#) of [rogue elements](#)

within the government of their ally: [Israel](#)). Do you doubt this? Former Senator [Bob Kerrey](#), who was also a member of the [9/11 Commission](#), has said, on video, that 9/11 was a *thirty-year* conspiracy (watch video [here](#)). Excuse me? The [conspiracy](#) to commit the terror attacks of September 11, 2001 goes back *thirty years*? I want Kerrey subpoenaed. I want to know what he knows. I will gladly grant him immunity if his testimony will put [Rumsfeld and Cheney](#), who I suspect to be the [guilty](#) masterminds of the terrorist operation, in the dock. Peter Lance, an investigative journalist, has documented the thirty-year [timeline](#) of events that surround the terror attacks of [9/11](#). What happened thirty years ago that could lend credibility to claims of a there having been a thirty-year conspiracy behind [9/11](#)? Hmm . . . let me think . . . oh, I know: [Donald Rumsfeld and Dick Cheney came into power with the Regan Administration! Iran-Contra, continuity of government, al Qaeda, Afghanistan, Osama bin Laden, the Mujahideen, CIA cocaine smuggling, Governor Clinton, Mena, Arkansas?](#) Sure, I remember all of that.

Did I say was DONE with the US government?! I am SO DONE!

When we march against the wars on [March 19, 2011](#), you can be sure that I am protesting a lot more than the wars . . . I am protesting my corrupt and murderous government, which has [no legitimacy](#) whatsoever, with the hope that one day Americans will wake up, get motivated, and [take this country back](#) from these criminals *for the People*.

Photo credit: © 2002 AP/Nasser Nasser "A Palestinian gunman [above] lets go of his rifle the moment he is fatally shot by an Israeli sniper during fighting in the West Bank city of Ramallah Friday, March 29, 2002. Sporadic gunfire and tank shell fire was heard as Israeli forces entered Ramallah Friday. Israeli forces surrounded Yasser Arafat's compound and occupied some buildings within" [source [link](#)]."

***** IMPORTANT BIBLICAL REFERENCE CONCERNING ISRAEL FOR ALL CHRISTIANS *****

For those of you who are Christians, as I am, I have some very important questions for you:

- 1) Have you ever read the Bible?
- 2) Do you understand what you're reading?

3) Do you understand that, according to Jesus himself, God rejected Israel over 2,000 years ago, because Israel, as a nation, rejected God's only begotten Son, Jesus?

4) Do you know where, in the Bible, this rejection of Israel by Christ (and God, the Father) can be found?

5) Do you believe in (and act upon) what Jesus said (and did)?

***** ANSWERS *****

Christ proclaimed Israel's rejection by God for Israel's rejection of himself as God's Messiah in the Gospel of St. Matthew, see: MT 23:38.

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the city that kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to it! How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you would not! See, your house is left to you desolate. For I tell you, you will not see me again, until you say, 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.'" (Matthew 23:37-39, ESV)

Jesus – and God, his Father – was DONE with Israel more than 2,000 years ago, according to Jesus and the Bible, so when will YOU decide to start believing in (and acting upon) what JESUS said, and STOP SUPPORTING ISRAEL?

Jesus on Israel – Bible Study: Matthew 23:38

The context for Matthew 23:37-39 – Matthew Chapter 23: Christ's "Seven Woes" to the Jewish Scribes and Pharisees:

<http://esv.scripturetext.com/matthew/23.htm>

English text of Matthew 23:38

<http://esv.scripturetext.com/matthew/23-38.htm>

Original Greek text of Matthew 23:38

<http://biblos.com/matthew/23-38.htm>

Greek-English Interlinear text of Matthew 23:38

<http://interlinearbible.org/matthew/23-38.htm>

The Greek word: "aphiémi", "desolate" or "abandoned", found in original Greek text of Matthew 23:38

<http://strongsnumbers.com/greek/863.htm>

Why I am SO DONE with Alex Jones – Egypt, Libya, Israel, and Charlie Sheen (An open letter to Mr. Jones)

More so than anyone else, [Alex Jones](#) appears to be seeking the truth behind government cover-ups, especially [9/11](#), which is very appealing to those of us who believe that [the current and corrupt regime that has reigned in Washington for over thirty-years \(Democrat and Republican\) needs to go](#). And I'm not talking about throwing the bums out in the next election, I'm talking about the American people marching on Washington in order to run those [murderous](#), lying, thieving, criminal, [snakes](#) out of their House and Senate office buildings in Washington, D. C. (non-violently, of course), just like the people are trying to do in [Egypt](#) and [Libya](#) to those who have ruled over them so poorly for the past thirty-to-forty years.

I think we all know that if the American people were ever to get serious about this, and actually do it, our "[leaders](#)" in Washington would [gun us down too](#). You know they would, just as the corrupt regimes in [Egypt](#) and [Libya](#) and [Bahrain](#) have done. And if that were to happen, all bets would be off as far as non-violence goes. I would be doing my best to rally the [30,000,000 good-ole boys](#) who live throughout rural America (with their pick-ups and their rifles) to head to D. C. for the fight. I would also expect the police and the military to switch sides in order to defend the American people against [our corrupt thirty-year old regime, just as they have in Libya](#). If that were ever to happen, I can assure you that Alex Jones would be in his studio in Austin, Texas, at his microphone, calling us all [dupes](#) of the [New World Order](#) blah, blah, blah

Do you realize why Obama and Clinton were so [hesitant](#) to back the people of Egypt when the Egyptian people had had enough of Mubarak's [corruption and murderous](#) ways? Because they knew the same exact thing could happen here, which is very unsettling to those in

power. Like Obama and Clinton, Alex Jones, rather backing the Egyptian people right away, as I did, chose to label the Egyptian people's revolution a [New World Order \(NWO\) conspiracy](#), and he considers the Egyptian and Libyan peoples to be [dupes](#) of the NWO. Excuse me Mr. Jones? People in Egypt and Libya are [willingly risking their lives](#) and [losing their lives](#) striving to be free of the tyranny that oppresses them; everything you say you support.

What a hypocrite. Alex Jones is great until things get serious; then he wants to take you off on a rabbit trail that leads to nowhere and will accomplish nothing. The supposed New World Order is far too nebulous a "thing" for the People to fight; it's more like boxing the air than it is throwing out the current regime, literally. What is Alex Jones' plan for the future? What will he do to help free us from tyranny? Call for a march on Washington to run those crooks out of town? NO. His plan, I suppose, is to [bullhorn](#) the [Bilderburg Group](#) for the next thirty years. What a waste of energy. The people who listen to Jones everyday would gladly march on Washington if he would call for it, but he never will. NEVER. What a lying hypocrite Mr. Jones is.

Think about this, if YOU had the opportunity Mr. Jones does to be on-air with such a large audience, would you not be broadcasting live from in front of the White House calling for non-violent regime change? Or would you be 1,500 miles away ensconced in your studio, which you're enlarging, talking about the NWO [ad nauseam](#)?

I am so DONE with Alex Jones . . . he didn't support [the people of Egypt](#), he [will not support the people of Libya](#), he supports the [Zionist](#) "two-state" solution, and he [USED Charlie Sheen](#) and his current manic state to further his own pathetic career. What a hypocrite. (Him and his ["v" campaign](#) . . . people are [flashing the "v" sign](#) ALL OVER Egypt and Libya and do you think he shows ONE video of it? No.)

Now is the time to strike, while the iron is hot. Now is the time to push, push, and keep on pushing. Anyone who has thought about this, and is sincerely seeking the truth, freedom, and justice, knows this and would be pushing too. But not Alex Jones . . . he will only push so far, and no farther. The biggest political problem we have in America is that Israel owns our Washington politicians lock, stock and barrel, and our politicians are using us and our children to fight Israel's battles for them. Yet Alex Jones SUPPORTS Israel and the Zionist two-state solution (?!). I wonder what Alex would do if the Mexicans took over a large area of south Texas by force? Call for a two-state solution?

And Alex Jones is supposedly *going somewhere* is his quest to uncover government corruption and cover-ups? Right.

The first time I learned about the Rockefellers, the Rothchilds, the Bilderburg Group, the Trilateral Commission, the Council on Foreign Relations, etc . . . was, oh, let me think . . . THIRTY YEARS AGO!!

Is there some truth to all of that NWO conspiracy stuff? Of course there is, and I'm glad that Alex Jones is waking people up to what's really going on, because (Lord knows) the American people need to wake-the-hell-up. Alex Jones himself says that his calling is to wake people up. In other words, he is not the one who will lead people to act. All of which is fine, yet, on the other hand, Mr. Jones is undermining those of us whose calling IS to act and who ARE acting (i.e., the Egyptian and Libyan peoples, at the present time). And we (they) don't need that. If you're not going to help Alex, then at least shut up and stop saying the Egyptian and Libyan peoples who are fighting for liberty and freedom are dupes of the NWO. You and your tired, going nowhere, NWO rabbit-trail, which does nothing but dissipate Patriot energies . . . are you just screwed up? Or are you doing this intentionally? Why not start backing the People instead of the corrupt, murderous, established orders Mr. Jones? Do you have a problem

with that? You say you believe in liberty and freedom, but you sure as hell don't act like it.

As for the Charlie Sheen fiasco, Mr. Jones, who says he's Charlie's friend, allowed Mr. Sheen to destroy his career [live on the Alex Jones Show](#); much to Jones' delight. Charlie's friend? Are you kidding me? I was listening to Alex's broadcast that day, and I knew five minutes into the show that Mr. Sheen did NOT belong on air. Had Alex truly been Charlie's friend, he would have known, immediately, as I did, that Charlie was in no mental condition to be talking on air, and he would have ended the interview at that point:

"Ok everyone, we're going to a break now . . . stay tuned . . . " [off air] "Charlie, you're out there man. . . you can't go on air and talk like that . . . I know, I'm [manic-depressive](#) too, I've been there, you're flying! [laughing] . . . we'll do this in a few months when you come down dude, and please don't go on any more radio shows, okay? [Go to the beach, for a month or two](#) . . . just chill and take a break man, you'll love it, forget all about [this crap](#) for a while, life is too short . . . if I let you keep talking on air like you are you'll ruin ruin yourself, you'll never work in [Hollywood](#) again man, you don't want that, or need that . . . and you're sure as hell not going to ruin your career on my show buddy! [laughing] I love you too much! Hey, tell me what island you decide to visit and I will TOTALLY be there to visit for a week or so. I need to forget about my own crap and chill for a while!" [on air] "We've lost Charlie's connection, and can't seem to get it back . . . so, I'm thinking we'll make today's broadcast like an open-line Friday and take listeners calls for the rest of the show. Last we spoke, Charlie's headed for some well-deserved [rest and relaxation somewhere in the Caribbean](#) and we wish him well . . . Okay, Robert from Oklahoma, what's on your mind today?"

But did Alex say this to Charlie? Or something like this? No. What he said and did was just the opposite.

Charlie's friend? Bullshit. More like he knowingly took advantage of Charlie's current manic state in order to further his own career. I wish I lived in Austin, or had the money to fly to Austin, I'd punch Alex Jones right in the mouth for what he did to Charlie. DONE with Alex Jones?! I was DONE when he didn't back the Egyptian people. Taking advantage of and USING Charlie Sheen and his current mental state in order to further his own pathetic career? A fist in his big f-ing mouth is what Alex Jones needs. Big blowhard. And if Charlie's still alive (and doesn't kill himself) six months from now and doesn't punch him in the mouth himself, I will gladly do it for him.

The End of the Nation-State?

Although you hardly ever hear anyone talk about it, the most promising hope for our political future, as human beings living on planet earth ([an oasis of life](#) in the middle of lots and lots ([and lots more lots](#)) of space), is the coming [demise](#) of the (already [out-dated](#)) concept of the [nation-state](#).

This may sound drastic, or unbelievable, because we are so accustomed to the concept of the nation-state, but the nation-state is, historically speaking, a rather recent political phenomenon. And time is telling as to whether or not this particular concept is progressive (as opposed to regressive) or even practical. So far, I think, the verdict is that the nation-state is the bloodiest concept yet devised by the mind of man, which doesn't bode well for its future, as a concept. The nation-state is like tribal warfare but on a much grander scale. Not very progressive, but frighteningly more efficient, especially at propagandizing and killing (even genocide).

If you are interested in why I am thinking along these lines, or wonder whatever gave me the idea that nations, as we know them, now, could, someday, soon, exist no more, simply read, study, and contemplate (as I have) the (over 2,000 year) history of political theory, which can be found in George H. Sabine's (nearly 1,000 page):

[A History of Political Theory](#)

As far as what's next, politically speaking, who knows. The continuation of the nation-state, for the foreseeable future? [Balkanization](#)? [Global government](#)? [Hemispherical Unions](#)? I tend toward favoring [localized government](#), which is similar to balkanization—but with *cooperation* rather than *hostility*—existing between people-groups. For [the Americas](#), I actually prefer a hemispherical (North, South, Central American) union, on some level, so

long as localized governments throughout the Americas are re-empowered to a much greater extent too. State governments throughout the Americas should have much more power and there should be much less federal power throughout the Americas. Federal power should always be kept to a minimum, focusing mainly upon international, I mean, cross-cultural exchange (i.e., trade, or commerce). The Americas could be much more efficient (as well as self-sufficient), economically, as well as being more locally controlled when it comes to just about everything *other than* cross-border commerce. (This same economic factor: cross-border commerce, was the driving force behind the adoption of the US Constitution over the states' old Articles of Confederation.)

No more standing armies either, or international, overseas, conflicts (wars). The US DOD could stand (close) down. And we could use their (our tax) money for housing, health care, and education. Right?

Something else to consider too: redrawing the state lines on a map of the US. Drastic, but necessary, eventually, I think. Funny how most people think we can't do things like that, but people can do such things; in time. The US is still very young, as a nation-state, and time will tell what becomes of it, and what it is to become. Imagine the possibilities.

"Wake up from your nightmare . . . and other sociopolitical essays - American activist political theory for the 21st century - is thought provoking reading, and may well inspire some people to act upon their most closely held beliefs; especially so once they realize the danger they're in."

Resources:

[Borderland Beat](#), [Jews Against Zionism](#), [9/11 Truth](#), [Time for a US Revolution - 15 Reasons](#), [Truth-out](#), [Anti-War.com](#), [Revolution News](#), [Find Law](#), [Internet Archive](#), [Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy](#), [G. H. Sabine: History of Political Theory](#), [biblos.com](#), [Glenn Greenwald](#), [MLK online](#), [Building What?](#), [Politico](#), [Peter Lance: 9/11 timeline](#), [History Commons: 9/11 Research](#), [Scibd](#), [PCHR](#), [Why We Fight](#)



A.J. MacDonald, Jr.
American writer, thinker, social critic
(1959 -)
theworldperceived.blogspot.com